

# THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

APRIL, 1916.

## HESIODEA III.

THE recently issued volume of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (Part XI.) contains new and important fragments from the Hesiodic Catalogue of Women; and the two substantial pieces grouped as No. 1358 are particularly welcome as shedding light upon two rather obscure sections of that work—the γῆς περιόδος, and the history of the Sons of Europa and Zeus. It goes without saying that the editors' treatment of these fragments is in every way admirable; and I trust it will not be regarded as an impertinence if I endeavour to restore a few lines which they have refrained from completing, and to offer an alternative reconstruction of a somewhat difficult passage.

### I.

*Frag. 1, Col. i, ll. 16 sqq.*

The editors are certainly right in their view that these lines deal with Sarpedon. The surviving fragment does not suit either Minos or Rhadamanthys, and notices of their 'honours' must have followed later. We may observe, in passing, that the fragment on Minos quoted by 'Plato' (*Minos*, 320 D) from Hesiod<sup>1</sup> is too summary to have served this purpose, and may be supposed to have occurred in connection with a notice of a heroine wedded by Minos. Two considerations make it worth while to attempt to restore this passage further than the discoverers have done: (1) l. 20 can be completed with some degree of confidence; and (2) the portent described in ll. 25 sqq. does not seem to be that which preceded the death of Sarpedon.

(1) GH, in dealing with the conflation of the two Sarpedons (p. 45), refer to Apollodorus III. i. 2: *καὶ αὐτῷ δίδωσι Ζεὺς ἐπὶ τρεῖς γενεὰς ζῆν*—a sentence which recalls a line in the complaint of Teiresias in the *Melampodia*:<sup>2</sup>

ἐπτά τ' ἐπὶ ζώειν γενεὰς μερόπων ἀνθρώπων.

It is possible that it is a coincidence merely, that l. 20 of the new papyrus ends exactly as does the verse from the *Melampodia*: ]. *μερόπων ἀνθρώπων*; but if

<sup>1</sup> Rzach (1908), *frag. 103.*

<sup>2</sup> Rzach, *frag. 161.*

we take the express statement of Apollodorus about Sarpedon fully into account, we may pretty confidently restore

[τρεῖς γὰρ ἐπὶ ζώειν γενεὰ]ς μερόπων ἀνθρώπων

and take this to be explanatory of *τιμή* in l. 18. For the first part of the following verse I suggest *μηδ' ἀπογηράσκειν*: such an amplification of the gift of longevity was obviously necessary whether Sarpedon ended his long life fighting before Troy, or was represented by our poet (see below) as living on after his fight with Patroclus. *ἀπογηράσκειν* occurs in Theognis (821), but not in Hesiod; *ἐντέλλειν* in l. 21 is not the verb one would have expected in this context, but need not create any difficulty.

(2) The passage (ll. 25-28) describing the portent is somewhat difficult. But the colon at the end of l. 23 indicates that Sarpedon is the personage *πολέμοιο δαήμων*, and that we cannot introduce Patroclus as slayer of Sarpedon in l. 24: nor can we fit the Homeric *ψιάδες αἰματοέσσαι* into the first part of l. 25, where they should occur, if at all, before the participial phrase *ἐπ' ἀριστ]ερὰ σήματα φαίνων*; nor, again, can these words, or an equivalent, find a place in l. 27—especially as the editors pronounce *αἴμ]ατος* out of the question. It seems almost impossible, then, to regard the portent under consideration as that which presaged the death of Sarpedon; indeed, the part played by the hero at Troy does not seem to be dealt with until ll. 29-30, and the narrative of his death may be thought to begin at l. 31. If this be so, the portent is most likely to have occurred as Sarpedon was setting out from Lycia for Troy, and ll. 25-26 may be restored in one of two ways. If the poet followed the Homeric account of the fate of Sarpedon we might read—

[τῷ δ' ὅρνιν προέκ' ἐπ' ἀριστ]ερά, σήματα φαίνων  
[κῆρα τε παιδὶ φίλῳ Ζεὺς] ἄφθιτα μῆδεα εἰδώς,

though in Homer Sarpedon has no such warning of his fate. I hope I shall not be thought perverse, however, in preferring a rather different type of reconstruction :

[οὐρανόθεν δὲ οἱ ἥκεν ὅγ' ἀστ]έρα, σήματα φαίνων  
[νόστον θ' υἱὸν φίλῳ Ζεὺς] ἄφθιτα μῆδεα εἰδώς.

Sarpedon did indeed return to Lycia—in the arms of Sleep and Death; but if that were the 'return' referred to, *νόστος* must be used here in a cruelly ironical sense. Is it not possible that the Hesiodic poet took advantage of Zeus' indecision (II. 436-7) to represent—perhaps with ulterior motives—that Sarpedon was carried off *alive* from the battle? He may, for example, have tried to smooth out the difficulties arising from the confusion of the two Sarpedons by transferring the Homeric account of Sarpedon I. (Z. 200-202) to the life of his composite Sarpedon *after he was carried back alive from Troy*. The process of reconciliation would be complete if we could suppose, further, that the hero was represented as being wounded only by Patroclus, and carried

back  
how  
con  
Z. 2  
such  
by t

The  
a ver  
make

<sup>1</sup> T

<sup>2</sup> T

back by Sleep and Death: perhaps Hera (as so often) was deceived. All this, however, would be building conjecture upon conjecture, were it not that the conflation of the two heroes necessitates the transference of the episode Z. 200-202 to the end of the life of the single figure, and that, without some such supposition, this episode must be thought to have been entirely ignored by the Hesiodic poet.

The whole passage, then, may be restored as follows:<sup>1</sup>

ἢ τοι ὁ μὲν Λυκίης τ' εὐρεῖης ἵφι ἄνασσε  
παμπολέας τ' θύννε πόλεις ἐν ναιεταώσας  
Ζηνὸς ἔχων σκῆπτρον. πολλὴ δὲ ἐσπετο τιμή,  
τὴν οἱ δῶκε πατήρ μεγαλήτορι ποιμένι λαῶν.  
20 τρεῖς γὰρ ἐπὶ ζώειν γενεὰς μερόπων ἀνθρώπων,  
μηδὲ ἀπογηράσκειν ἐντείλατο μητίετα Ζεύς.  
πέμπε δέ μιν Τροίηδε. πολὺν δὲ ἐκρίνατο λαόν,  
λεκτούς ἐκ Λυκίης φῶτας Τρώεσσ' ἐπίκουρους.  
τοὺς ἄγε Σαρπηδῶν κρυεροῦ] πολέμοιο δαήμων.  
25 οὐρανόθεν δὲ οἱ ἡκεν ὅγ' ἀστέρα, σήματα φαίνων  
νόστον θ' νύ φίλῳ Ζεύς] ἀφθιτα μήδεα εἰδάσ.  
[ατοι ἀμφιβαλούσαις  
εὐ γὰρ ἐνὶ φρεσὶ οἴδ' ὅτι δῆ] Διόθεν τέρας ἡνε.  
ἢ μέγ' ἀρίστευσέν τε μεθ' Ἐκτόρος ἀνδοφόνοιο  
30 καὶ τεῖχος ρῆξεν. Δαναοῦσι] δὲ κήδε' ἔθηκεν.  
ἀλλ' ὅτ' ἀρ' ἔμπνευσεν κρατερὸν μένος Ἀργείο[ο]ισι  
Πάτροκλος . . . .

L. 16. GH (with τ' inserted).

L. 18. cp. Hesiod *frag.* 103. l. 3.

L. 20. cp. Hesiod *frag.* 166. l. 5.

L. 22. cp. Z. 168, 207: the subject of πέμπε is Zeus.

L. 23. cp. Z. 188.

L. 25. cp. Δ. 475.

L. 30. cp. M. 290-293.

## II.

*Frag.* 2, Col. i, ll. 8 sqq.

Line 8 stands thus in the papyrus—

[. . . . .] ἐπι εργα· καὶ γ[

The mark of elision immediately after the initial lacuna suggests that either a verb or τ' preceded by a genitive should be restored, and the καὶ<sup>2</sup> following makes the latter almost certain. Probably, then, the final lacuna also covers a

<sup>1</sup> The numeration is that of the papyrus.

comma: cp. ll. 9, 26.

<sup>2</sup> The high stop seems to have the value of a

race-name in the genitive. In the notices of the γῆς περιόδος (Hesiod, *frag.* 60-62) only one race-name begins in H- — the Ἡμίκυνες. I suggest, then, that the line may have ended καὶ Ἡμίκυνων ἀγερώχων (the epithet being mock-heroic, as in *Batrachomyomachia* 145). Stephanus of Byzantium<sup>1</sup> describes the Ἡμίκυνες as 'a race not far from the Hyperboreans and the Massagetae': the Hyperboreans are indeed mentioned in the papyrus-fragment (l. 20); but no reference to Ἡμίκυνες or Massagetae can be worked in there or near that place. It is therefore likely enough that the Hyperboreans were mentioned earlier, somewhere above l. 8; and that the first part of l. 8 was [Μασσαγετῶν τοῦ] ἐπὶ ἔργα. This restoration is, of course, mere conjecture; but it may be put forward as a reasonable possibility.

The discoverers give in their notes (pp. 49-50) a tentative reconstruction of ll. 10 sqq., following Professor Murray's suggestion that the φῦλον Ὀνείρων may have been introduced here. My reason for offering an alternative is the apparent parallelism between ll. 9-10 and 17-18. The former stands as follows in the editors' text—

[. . . . .] Κατονδάιων · καὶ Πυγμαῖων  
[. . . . .] απειρεσίων μελάνο [

the latter reads—

[. . . . .] μελανες τε καὶ Αἰ[θ]ιοπες μεγαθυμοι  
[ηδε Κατονδάιοι καὶ Πυγμαῖοι] αμενητοι.

In one line of each pair the Pygmies and Κατονδάιοι are mentioned, and in the other we have μελάνο[ corresponding to μέλανες. If we accept the editors' μελανό[πτερον δχλον, we must pronounce the apparent correspondence between the two pairs to be accidental and the result of coincidence; but this is not likely. Is it not better to regard l. 17 as substantially equivalent to l. 10, and, ignoring the accent of μελάνο[ (which it would be hard to retain in any case), to restore the latter—

[φῦλα τ' ἀπειρεσίων Μελανο[χρώτων Λιβύων τε]?

The correspondence between the two couplets is thus restored; and it is a matter of no moment that in l. 10 the Aethiopians are merely 'black-skins,' while in l. 17 they rejoice in their proper name and the Libyans<sup>2</sup> are called black: to the poet, doubtless, both peoples were equally black. μελανόχρως indeed seems to have no earlier authority than Euripides (*Hecuba*, 1106); but the Homeric forms μελανόχροος (τ. 146) and μελανόχροες (N. 589) may help to justify its use here. It is a form which a poet might conceivably invent for himself if indeed it were not already current. The use of a descriptive epithet in place of the noun to which it is ordinarily applied is, of course, a characteristic feature of Hesiod, as ἀνόστεος (*Works* 524); ἄτριχος (*Fr.* 96, l. 91).

<sup>1</sup> Hesiod, *frag.* 62, 3 (Rzach).

<sup>2</sup> The editors' restoration of l. 17 τοῦ Λιβυς] μελανες is surely confirmed by l. 15 (as against Professor Murray's Κόλχοι γάρ] μελανες).

What, then, of ll. 11-14? Probably the editors' restoration is as suited to the new context as to the old, except that *κωφούς* is no longer suitable at the opening of l. 13, and Mr. Lobel's *'Επαφος* might be inserted in l. 11. And if l. 12 does indeed ascribe seercraft to the Libyans, the reference—vague as it is—is doubtless to the famous Oracle of Amen at Siwah in the Libyan Desert.

I have ventured only to change the epithet in l. 11: ll. 13-14 are restored to convey the sense that those who seek to outwit the oracle will be misled by it and involve themselves in *άτη* (cp. *Hymn to Hermes*, 546-549).

For convenience the whole passage, in which the editors' restorations and those suggested above are combined, is here given:

[Μασσαγετῶν τ'] ἐπὶ ἔργα, καὶ Ἡ[μικύνων ἀγερώχων]  
 [ἡδὲ Κατονδ]αιών, καὶ Πυγ[μαίων ἀμενήνων,]  
 10 [φῦλα τ' ἀπε]ιρεσίων Μελανφ[χρώτων Λιβύων τε ·]  
 [τοὺς Ἐπάφῳ] τέκε Γαῖα πελώ[ρη χρησμόλογούς τε]  
 [μαντοσύνη]ς τε πανομφαίο[ν Διός ειδότας αἰση,  
 [ψεύστας δ', ὅ]φρα θεοῖσιν ὑφε[ιμ]ένοι ἀτασ[θῶ]σιν  
 [ἄνθρωποι], τῶν μέν τε νόος [γλ]ωσσῆς καθ[ύπ]ερθεν.

HUGH G. EVELYN-WHITE.

RAMPTON, NEAR CAMBRIDGE.

quite  
dorm

SOPHOCLES, *ELECTRA*, vv. 137 sqq.

ἀλλ' οὗτοι τόν γ' ἔξ 'Αἰδα  
παγκοίνου λίμνας πατέρα ἀνστάσεις  
οὔτε γόοις οὔτε λιταῖσιν ·

So the MSS.

In metre these lines correspond with vv. 121-122:

ὦ παῖ, παῖ δυστανοτάτας  
'Ηλέκτρα ματρός, τίν' ἀεὶ τάκεις  
ἄδ' ἀκόρεστον οἰμωγάν.

In a previous article I have cited these lines in support of my emendation 'Ηλέκτρη' ἀτον for the MS. text 'Ηλέκτρα τὸν', v. 1075. With Jebb I tacitly agreed that the word-order ἄδ' ἀκόρεστον οἰμωγάν was correct. The metre of vv. 138-9 οὔτε γόοις οὔτε λιταῖσιν must therefore be defective.

Hermann's emendation οὔτε γόοισιν οὔτ' ἄνταις has been as a rule accepted by subsequent editors. Jebb has pointed out that ἄντη is not well attested. A further objection is that the poet emphasizes the lament and mourning of the unhappy Electra rather than her prayers. Cf. vv. 89 sqq.:

ὦ δύσθεον μίσημα, σοὶ μόνη πατὴρ  
τέθνηκει; ἄλλος δ' οὕτις ἐν πένθει βροτῶν;  
κακῶς δλοιο, μηδέ σ' ἐκ γώων ποτὲ  
τῶν νῦν ἀπαλλάξειαν οἱ κάτω θεοί.

This passage shows that her mourning and her laments were the main points of her grief.

We may compare *Il.* 17. 37:

ἀρητὸν τοκεῦσι γόον καὶ πένθος ἔθηκας.

A reference to her λιταῖσιν or ἄνταις would therefore be pointless.

In uncials the scribe read:

IN  
ΟὢΤΕ ΓΟΟΙC ΟΤΙΠΕΝΘΕΙ

The two letters IN of γόοισιν were first omitted and then inserted above the line. Under the influence of the preceding οὔτε, οὔπε became οὔτε. The nu (N) was broken up into lambda iota (ΛΙ). The unintelligible λιθει was transformed into λιταις, to which was appended the IN that belonged to γόοισιν, giving λιταισιν.

So the sentence runs :

ἀλλ' οὗτοι τόν γ' ἔξ 'Αιδα  
παγκοίνου λίμνας πατέρα ἀνστάσεις  
οὔτε γόνιστν οὐ πένθει.

On palaeographical grounds *οὐ πένθει* for *οὔτε λιταῖσιν* is to my mind quite satisfactory.

Pitfalls of the palaeographical sort are manifold into which the *scriba dormitans* tumbled. Take for instance Euripides, *Helena* 1366 sq. :

εὐ δέ νν ἄλμασιν  
ὑπέρβαλε σελάνα  
μορφᾶ μόνον ηύχεις.

In his text Murray says : 1366 sq. *locus concludatus*.

The keynote to the whole passage is the *παννυχίδες θεᾶς* of v. 1365. Dreaming of the moon shedding its rays on the festive hosts the scribe wrongfully transcribed *σελάνα*.

With much diffidence I propose :

ΕΤΔΕΝΙΝΑΛΑΜΑΣΙΝ  
ΤΠΕΡΒΑΛΕΣΕΛΕΝΑ  
ΜΟΡΦΑΙ ΜΟΝΟΝΗΤΧΕΙC

i.e.

εὐ δέ νν ἄλμασιν  
ὑπέρβαλες, 'Ελέν', ἄ  
μορφᾶ μόνον ηύχεις.

H. G. VILJOEN.

MIDDELBURG (CAPE).

## THE FORMAL BEAUTY OF THE *HERCVLES FVRENS*.

MANY critics have condemned, some have defended, Euripides for composing a play 'altogether wanting in the satisfaction which nothing but a unity of ideas could produce.' It helps us little to marvel, with Paley, at the 'obtuseness of critics who forsooth prefer "unity of ideas" to profoundly moving incidents, etc.,' though it may be admitted that Paley has detected part of the truth when he calls attention to the importance of the fact that Athens is, throughout the play, the only possible asylum for the hero. Verrall's analysis has the merit that it attempts to account for the play as a whole, but it is hard to believe that the Athenian audience was composed of subtle critics, endowed with Verrall's ingenuity and acumen. Still, though it is easy to disagree with Verrall, it is less easy to give the reasons for one's disagreement. In detail one can say: 'The straightforward and obvious sense of the words is adequate; the subtle suggestion is not likely to have occurred to an audience which had never heard of Schlegel or of Swinburne.' That leaves us with the fact that the impression made on most of us by the whole work is not one of formal perfection. To most readers there seem to be three episodes, each excellent, but not intimately connected with the other two: in the first we are concerned for the fate of the tyrant Lycus, and rejoice at his just destruction; in the second we are moved by the sudden reversal in the fortunes of the beneficent Heracles; and in the third we are impressed by the magnanimity, and, perhaps, delighted with the Athenian connections, of the excellent Theseus. There is a good deal of talk which we ascribe to the tendency of Euripides to make his characters the mouthpieces for current debate. There are choral odes which we think charming, but, on the whole and as a rule, slightly irrelevant to the main 'incidents.' My purpose in this paper is to suggest, first, that the audience was occupied with certain quite familiar ideas upon which Euripides has built his play, and was, therefore, not at leisure to catch at subtleties of detail, suggestions, ambiguities, ironies, points of logic and of lack of logic, such as Verrall emphasizes; and, secondly, that if we also remember these ideas, we shall find both unity in the construction and relevance in the choral odes.

The drama ends with a formal sentence from Heracles, which, in fact—though the critics seem to miss the fact—states in a final summary the theme that has given beauty to the whole:

He hath not health of mind who would possess  
Or wealth or strength—rather than faithful friends.

The response of the chorus, as it retires, is relevant :

And we have lost our friend !  
And so we go in sorrow and in tears.

The word *έφολκίδες*, spoken by Heracles immediately before his final sentence, recalls to the audience (quietly and, indeed, only subconsciously) the words with which the hero led his children into the palace (line 631). If you will look at the context of those words you will at once perceive the subtlety of the formal construction. There, as at lines 1,424 sqq., you will find that the phrase so pathetically recalled is followed by the mention, first of human love, then, and at first sight strangely, by a reference to the comparative unimportance of money :

Here all mankind are equal.  
Men who are nothing, men of the better sort,  
All love their children. Where's the difference  
'Twixt have and have-not ? Money ! Yet the love  
For their own children toucheth all alike.

The keynote of the play, then, is the thought that human love is better than money, better than physical strength. It is an old text of *Sophrosyne* : 'Put not your trust in riches, nor in strength : they are unstable : man knows not whether they shall turn to his advantage or his hurt.' When Theseus banishes the thought that Heracles has been transformed by his act of madness into a loathsome and abominable pollution, Euripides is grafting upon the ancient doctrine a new and pregnant moral.<sup>1</sup> How moving and how beautiful the introduction of that moral has been made we shall not realize unless we trace the themes of wealth and strength and friendship in the earlier scenes of the play. Heracles relied on strength, and his calamity has shown that strength can be a man's undoing as well as his salvation. Lycus, the usurper, aimed at riches unjustly, and has met the ruin he deserved. Theseus, the true friend, is greatest in his friend's adversity.

That thought pervades the play. It is for this that Amphitryon is made to end the prologue with the sententious words (lines 55 sqq.) :

Some of our friends prove false. They that are true  
Have not the power to aid us. 'Tis the tale  
Told ever by the unfortunate, a tale,  
I pray, that none may tell who bear to me  
One thought of common kindness : 'tis the test  
And touchstone of true friends, Adversity.

Nor is it by accident that Megara, when she takes up the tale, introduces the first notes of the other theme, the theme of wealth and kingship. Her father, she tells us, was a man

<sup>1</sup> 1234 οὐδεὶς ἀλλοτροπεῖ τοῖς φίλοις ἐκ τῶν φίλων.

Once vaunted high for wealth and happiness  
 Because he was a King—and for a throne  
 Your happy men run passionate, and welcome  
 The spearthrust in the flesh. He was a King . . .  
 And blest with children. To your son he gave  
 His daughter, mating me with Heracles  
 The man of glory.

The value of that speech will not be apparent unless we remember how familiar to a Greek audience is the combination of *δλβος* and *δόξα* as the attributes of Kingship. Heracles is, of course, pre-eminently *ό κλεινός*. It is with bitter irony that his title is applied by Amphitryon to the usurper at line 38, and the fact gives value to the words *τοὺς Ἡρακλείους παιδας* in line 39. The same familiar combination gives pathos to the words of Megara at lines 336 sqq.:

Come, children, come. With your sad mother pass  
 Into your father's house, whereof the wealth  
 Owns a new master . . . the good name is ours !

Nor are these references to the fame of Heracles forgotten in the tragic sequel. They contribute, whether we realize it or not, to the emotion stirred by the hero's lament for 'the good inheritance of glory' he had hoped to leave his sons (line 1,370).

But there is more than this. Just as Amphitryon's words prepare us for the magnanimity of Theseus and for the great development, in his person, of the theme of friendship, so the words of Megara attune our minds for the usurper's covetous ambition and his fall. Before the prelude ends, we hear from Amphitryon (lines 101-106) the familiar theme of the mutability of human fortune, spoken by him as reason for good hope, but suggesting to the audience, who know what is to come, the fall, not only of the tyrant, but also of the deliverer. Of the entry of the chorus I will only say that we have no right to complain of schoolboy laughter at the fatuity of these old gentlemen, with their so frank admission of their feebleness and senility—for all purposes save song—unless we explain to our class that Euripides is adapting for a new purpose a familiar convention, used with great effect by Aeschylus in the *Agamemnon*. Nor will our explanation make much difference, unless we add that the contrast, so conventionally introduced, between the weakness of age and the strength of youth is to be developed as one of the main *motifs* of the drama. These old men are weak for all purposes save song. To what purpose they will sing, we shall presently see. They are weak, and their weakness makes them long for the strength of Heracles. Nor is it accidental that their very phrasing is recalled by Amphitryon at 228 sqq. Presently Heracles himself will learn, in his own weakness (1,394 sqq.), that strength alone cannot save. Need I add that the last words of the *epode οῖονς οῖονς δλέσασα . . . (136)*

are not without relevance to the last words of the play *τὰ μέγιστα φίλων διλέσαντες?*

When the usurper, Lycus, appears we are left in no doubt that he is to behave as the typical bad king, or 'tyrant.' His might is his right (141), and, like all tyrants, he speaks of his persecution as 'due regard for safety' (165): the true caution of a king who looks for safety in his moderation, he lacks. He fears, as a tyrant proverbially does, all good men (208); and, in contrast to Heracles, the good king who has earned his title by service to his country (186, 220), he receives from Amphitryon the name of 'worst of kings.' His wickedness culminates in a reassertion of might as the basis of his right, when he cries: 'Burn the suppliants . . . that they may know, 'tis not the dead man is to-day the Master here (*κρατεῖ* 246), but I.' What follows? He turns to the old citizens who sympathize with the ancient royal house, and chides them in the tone of Aegisthus in the *Agamemnon*, telling them: 'When the blow has fallen, you will recognize yourselves, the slaves of my *Tyrannis*!' In that phrase, *Tyrannis* is not simply 'Kingship': definitely and certainly it is an unconstitutional, immoral, violent rule. And the word is used from this point onward (388, 474, 567, 644) in the evil sense. Three times in our immediate context we hear the odious name of Master (254, 274, 278). The thought that Lycus is a wicked tyrant, possessing all the odious characteristics of his detestable class, gains further strength from the contrast which the choral ode (348 sqq.) implies with the beneficent Heracles, whose claim to be a just and rightful king is based upon his service to mankind.

It was not Antisthenes or Xenophon or Plato who invented the stock tyrant and elaborated the contrast between the good king and the bad. Homer's good king is 'gentle, like a father to his people'; and his bad king lives and fights for his own gain. Thucydides did not invent the theory that the policy of despots is self-seeking: Aristotle did not discover for himself the notion that good kings derive their power from their own service to their fellow-citizens. Lycus gets his character not from Euripides, but from the proverbial talk of generations of democratic or aristocratic poets, politicians and gossips. Now one main and almost invariable element in the picture of the stock bad king is his greed for wealth, his covetous desire to have riches, at the expense, if need be, of justice and of modesty. Lycus is treated as a conventional tyrant in order that his fall may illustrate the futility of wealth.

The hero returns and saves his family. We must ignore, for the moment, the main interest of the scene, and fix our attention on the motives and conduct of Lycus. In 588 we learn the nature of the 'civil strife' which gave him his chance of usurpation. His supporters are 'many poor men, poor though they pass for rich, who cause sedition and ruin the city, in order that they may prey upon their neighbours—since their own estates had gone in spendthrift extravagance because of their idleness.' We are thus introduced to the familiar motive of the tyrant's 'unjust gains.' This thought, that Lycus and his party aimed at wealth, and for the moment have won it, is the dramatic

reason for several phrases in the chorus (637 sqq.) which praises youth at the expense of old age, declaring that good men should have a double span of youth to distinguish them from bad, because, at present, Wealth (673) is the only sign of superiority. It is because of the relevance of this theme that the chorus sing, in our familiar ancient formula : 'Not for me the wealth of an Asiatic *Tyrannis*, not for me a house full of gold in exchange for Youth!' The strength of youth is the strength of Heracles. The gold is the gold of the usurper.

In his last short swaggering appearance the tyrant is reminded by Amphitryon of the 'modest mean' which he has always neglected (709), and he passes to his fate in the spirit of a doomed man, confident and free from fear (723).

The chorus which celebrates his fall has been in part elucidated by Walter Headlam, who points out that it is clearly modelled on the ideas of Aeschylus *Agamemnon* 381 sqq., 470 sqq. In one point, however, I think that Headlam has missed the sense through a false reading.<sup>1</sup> In the *Agamemnon* the wicked man is destroyed by *pride* in his wealth and success. That is what actually happened to Agamemnon. Lycus became a tyrant through *greed* for wealth and success, which is a different matter. As I have tried to show elsewhere, grammar demands the reading *φθονεῖν* for *φρονεῖν* in 775. This is what the chorus say :

'The gods indeed attend to the injustice and the piety of men. . . . Gold and Prosperity lure a man to envy them, and so produce' (i.e. by making him compass it) 'a Tyranny: but in the end the Reverse of Fortune is too terrible to contemplate. The usurper, having once thrown over law' (i.e. in his usurpation) 'gives the rein to his lawlessness' (as did Lycus in his persecution of the children of Heracles), 'and so smashes to pieces the chariot of his prosperity, now black with ruin.'

So much for Lycus and his wealth. Let us return to Heracles. He is, of course, by no means a conventional 'good king': the passionate human spirit of this living hero is more moving to us precisely because the tyrant whom he overthrows has been presented as a figure of traditional outline and of meagre personality. Yet we shall miss not only poetic value, but also tragic significance, if we ignore the lyrics, and treat the hero simply as the creation of a free and realistic imagination. He is more than that. He stands for the triumphant strength of mortal men, who often, when their strength is greatest, stand before the crisis of their mortal weakness.

We have seen that the choral ode which precedes the hero's return contributes to the drama by contrasting the true ruler with the false. We have now to add that it contributes to the greater tragedy by celebrating the strength of Heracles, the source of his calamity. The final stanza (436 sqq.), in which the old men again lament that the strength of youth has left them,

<sup>1</sup> See Headlam, in *J.Ph.* XXX., p. 297 sq., p. 68 sq. and my note in *Class. Rev.* XXIX., May, 1915.

heightens once more our sense of the importance of this theme. Before the entrance of the deliverer both Megara and Amphitryon speak words on which I make no other comment than this: that I hope no critic will now call them 'undramatic.' First Megara tells how Heracles, 'proud in his strength of manhood'—ominous words—had promised kingdoms (474 *Tyrannides*) to his little sons. Then Amphitryon, in a magnificent oration, laments the fugitive hopes of men, and tells us how his own great wealth and reputation have melted away. Surely all this is not irrelevant to the coming tragedy? Well, if you are not satisfied, look back to the chorus in which the hero's great achievements have just been sung by persons who believe that he is dead. 'Phoebus,' say these mourners, 'laments for Linus, who died because of his beauty. We sing a nobler hero, even Heracles, who perished in toil and virtuous labours for mankind.' No irony is there: no hint to the audience of disaster. The main point is the honourable labour, now apparently thrown away. The strength (434) to which his children looked for protection is no longer with them. Then look again at the ode which celebrates the helper's safe return. See how the theme of strength is now developed (637 sqq.)—this time with hints of triumph, and, in one respect, of a very dangerous kind of triumph.

The first passage, which has in mind the conflict with Lycus and his wealth, we have already discussed. But the second half, in which the chorus say that they still can sing, and would not live without the Muses, is not simply (as has been supposed) a sentimental and irrelevant expression of a laudable devotion to poetry. Why will these old people cling to their music? To sing, with the aid of Mnemosyne, the triumph song for Heracles! 'The Delian maidens sing their Paean in honour of Apollo.' This chorus will chant its paean too, but for Heracles! Not only does this passage delightfully recall the earlier ode (where Phoebus sang of Linus, our chorus of Heracles), but surely, also, it reaches a pitch of dangerous praise. The famous Heracles is too famous now for security. 'Let others sing to Apollo. We will sing to you, the very son of Zeus!' (687 sqq.).

Am I indulging my fancy? Well, when you turn to the hymn of triumph over the usurper's fall, when you have heard of the ruinous end of unjust wealth, what follows? You return to the praise of Heracles, and it is expressed in very remarkable terms. The Nymphs of the Theban waters are to sing for him (lines 784 sqq.); the rocks of Apollo's Delphi and the haunts of the Heliconian Muses are actually to come to Thebes to express their admiration. The son of Zeus? Of course he is! (Theseus, and Heracles himself, in his right mind, know that it is Euripidean impiety to suppose it, 1,316, 1,341.) Time has revealed the hero's strength in all its splendour. And better Heracles as despot (*Tyrannus*) of the land than the ill-born king that is fallen.

This excessive adulation is the prelude to the fall of the hero. Do not, please, suppose that I am trying to show that Euripides thought the fate of Heracles was just. I only suggest that he made it more exciting by this use

of the current notion that excessive confidence and excessive praise are dangerous. I submit that Sophocles has even more subtly used a similar method. His Oedipus, whom the priest has honoured almost, not quite, as if he were more than human, is hailed by the chorus as the son of a god in the moment of reckless confidence which immediately precedes his fall. And although he certainly is not ruined because of pride, the contrast between his transitory, yet almost superhuman, greatness and the sure abiding Kingship of the Zeus who governs all the world, contributes much to the tragic significance of his fall. Similarly, though Oedipus is not, by any means, an adventurer, set on his own profit, Sophocles, to the confusion of the critics, has introduced the theme of the unjust gain. Oedipus is disinterested, a ruler who cares more for his people than for his own life. Yet, when he thinks a plot is on foot against his throne, he behaves for a moment as if he were a suspicious, grasping despot. The chorus tremble for him, and fear that he is one 'who will not follow justice in his pursuit of gain.' We know that they are wrong. But the tragedy moves us all the more because we see that they have some excuse for their mistake: and we have little patience with the editors who think the Sophoclean ode 'irrelevant.'

Many details have been omitted. Much illustration would be needed if I were to try to show how familiar are the fundamental commonplaces to the audience.<sup>1</sup> Enough, I hope, has been said to show the reader the main lines on which the criticism of the composition should proceed. Turn again to the last words of the hero:

ὅστις δὲ πλοῦτον ή σθένος μᾶλλον φίλων  
ἀγαθῶν πεπᾶσθαι βούλεται, κακῶς φρονεῖ.

I said that in this play Euripides has given a new and beautiful significance to an old text of *Sophrosyne*. *Sophrosyne* means that a mortal man should think the thoughts that befit a mortal. And, let us remember,

τὸ μὴ κακῶς φρονεῖν  
θεοῦ μέγιστον δῶρον.

How deep is the thought which lies behind the commonplace you may realize if you think of the Stoic prayer—not for riches, but for *mens sana in corpore sano*, or of its Christian equivalent, the prayer for 'health in mind, body, and estate.' Health in estate means, not the wealth of Gyges, Midas, Pelops, Lycus, but a modest competence with good sense for its enjoyment. Health in body means, not the power to wrestle with lions and to overthrow force by force, but a sufficient freedom from great physical pain or weakness.

<sup>1</sup> Here is one good example:—Pindar, *Isthmians* III. 1: *εἰ τις ἀνδρῶν εὐτυχῆσται η σὺν εὐδόκεος δέθοις η σθένει πλοῦτον κατέχει φραστὸν αἰανῆ κόρον...* Here you have the athlete's strength and glory, the rich man's power and wealth combined: and the moral is, of course, *Sophrosyne*: *ζῶει δὲ μάστιν δλβος δπιζομένων πλαγίαις δὲ φρένεσσιν οὐχ ὅμως πάντα χρόνον θάλλων ὁμιλεῖ.* Nor can I refrain from quoting the familiar lines in which Theocritus has given so characteristic a reading of *Sophrosyne*:

*μη μοι γάν Πλεοτος, μη μοι Κροτεσια τάλαντα  
εἰη ἔχειν, μηδὲ πρόσθε θέειν ἀνέμων.  
ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τὰ πέτρα τρέδ' φσομαι, ἀγκὰς ἔχων τυ . . .*

Health of mind—well, we know that it means contentment with the modest measure of prosperity justly won : and we know that this is missed by men such as Lycus. We know also that it means a modest sense of the relative importance of ourselves and of the universe. The much-abused Euripidean discussion of the myth of the hero's divine origin is not, after all, so irrelevant as critics think. But Euripides, if I am not mistaken, has something even better to commend than modesty of mind. When the world has learnt the insignificance of the wealth which force can ravish, and which force can take again from the ravisher . . . or dissipate in the attempt to take it : when it has learnt that the force which may be used for the deliverance of the oppressed, may also, unless love and reason wield it, be abused, and turn the deliverer into the executioner of his own children, the murderer of his own hopes : then it may recognize the value of the poet's craft. In the meantime, it is not because the syntax of dead languages affords so excellent an intellectual gymnastic, but because the Greeks can teach us something of the value of such things as moderation, reason, and, above all, friendship, that it is still worth while to teach more Greek than chemistry at school.

J. T. SHEPPARD.

KING'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

Menela  
Second  
scarcely  
of passi  
so if it

The  
dislike  
employ  
ai ἄγαν  
prompt  
after w  
that he  
of appe  
Menela  
one exp  
persuad  
(I borr  
‘will tr  
context  
reason  
reasons

In  
whether  
of it at  
Second  
Or, in  
has be  
sequen  
constru

II  
some  
parent:

‘Ενό  
second

<sup>1</sup> If th  
may ha

## ON TWO PASSAGES OF THE *ORESTES*.

696: ‘The populace,’ says Menelaus, ‘when roused to anger, is difficult to deal with; but if when it rages one slacks the sheet, watching an opportunity, the storm may blow itself out. And when it moderates its blasts, one may easily win one’s will of it.<sup>1</sup> It is capable of pity and nobility, qualities most precious to one who bides his time.’

696 δὲ Τυνδάρεών τέ σοι πειράσομαι  
705 πόλιν τε πεῖσαι τῷ λίαν χρῆσθαι καλῶς.  
καὶ ναῦς γὰρ ἐνταθεῖσα πρὸς βίαν ποδὶ<sup>2</sup>  
ἔβαψεν, ἔστη δ’ αὐθις ἦν χαλᾶ πόδα.  
μισεῖ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τὰς ἄγαν προθυμίας,  
μισούσι δ’ ἀστοι· δεῖ δέ μ’, οὐκ ἄλλως λέγω,  
710 σώζειν σε σοφίᾳ μὴ βίᾳ τῶν κρεισσόνων.

The objection to ll. 704-7 as they stand at present is this. In 706 sq. Menelaus figures himself as a navigator saving the ship by judicious manipulation of the sheets in a storm. Now since the ship with which Menelaus is concerned carries the fortunes, not of Tyndareos and Argos, but of Orestes, it is plain that in 705 *χρῆσθαι* should depend directly on *πειράσομαι*; for as long as *πεῖσαι* intervenes between them, Menelaus is made to say that his efforts are concerned with the safety of Tyndareos, and that is not only false but in the highest degree inappropriate. The two sentences can be reduced to order by reading for *πεῖσαι*, *πείσας* with Hermann, *πείθων* with Weil, or (if anyone thinks that an improvement) *θέλγων* with Wecklein: that is, by sacrificing the form of the first couplet.

Now it is to be observed that 704 sq., if they stood alone, would provide perfectly satisfactory sense: ‘I will try and persuade Tyndareos and the city to temper passion with discretion,’ or, in short, ‘to behave like gentlemen.’ The words *τῷ λίαν χρῆσθαι καλῶς* elude translation, but that, I take it, is what they mean, and I venture to think that but for 706 sq. no one would suspect that Menelaus, not Tyndareos, could be the subject of *χρῆσθαι*. For if Menelaus is the subject, then *τῷ λίαν χρῆσθαι καλῶς* means ‘to make good use of *their* passion,’ and that rendering leaves upon my mind three unfavourable impressions, for I will not claim that they are more than impressions. First and least important, that if Euripides had wished us to understand that

<sup>1</sup> I am not here concerned with the difficulties of 698-701, and give what I conceive to be the sense. The metaphor is nautical, and for my present purpose that suffices.

Menelaus is the subject, it would have been charitable to write *σοφῶς*. Secondly, that *τὸ λίαν* in Euripides is a fault of personal conduct or temper scarcely at the disposal of a second party. Thirdly, that 'to make good use of passion' is an intelligible expression if it means 'to return to reason;' hardly so if it means, as on this hypothesis it must, 'to bring to reason.'

There is one other point. What 708 means I am not certain, and if the dislike of heaven and earth for *ai ἄγαν προθυμίαν* is Menelaus's reason for employing diplomacy only at this juncture, there is no more to be said. But *ai ἄγαν προθυμίαν* is an odd description of military coercion or the mood which prompts it, and Menelaus has said just before (ll. 688 sqq.) and repeats just after with emphasis (711 sqq.) that his real reason for not resorting to force is that he has no force to resort to; and with that sufficient reason a mere fear of appearing officious consorts strangely. But if these *ἄγαν προθυμίαν* are not Menelaus's, they are Tyndareos's and the city's, and the phrase is, as, after all, one expects, a paraphrase of *τὸ λίαν*. And if so, I suggest that 'I will try and persuade Tyndareos and the city to behave reasonably, for over-vehemence' (I borrow from Mr. Way) 'is disliked by gods and men' is sense, and that 'will try by persuasion to make good use of their unreason for, etc.,' in this context is not. The impiousness and unpopularity of *ai ἄγαν προθυμίαν* are a reason which Menelaus will urge with Tyndareos, but they are not among the reasons which prompt his own proposed *démarche*.

In view of these considerations, therefore, what I ask here is this. First, whether having had a ship and storm metaphor in 698 sqq. and got clear of it at 702, anyone admires its repetition in slightly different form at 705. Secondly, whether 708 would not look better if it immediately followed 705. Or, in short, whether 706 sq. are not an adscript parallel to 698-701<sup>1</sup> which has been incorporated by accident and in the wrong place, interrupting the sequence of the discourse and compelling us first to emend and then to construe unnaturally a straightforward sentence in 704 sq.

1163: 'Since I must die,' says Orestes, 'I should like to do my enemies some mischief first in return for their treachery. I will not disgrace my parentage by a servile death, but

1170

εἰλευθέρως

ψυχὴν ἀφήσω Μενέλεων δὲ τίσομαι.  
ἐνὸς γὰρ εἰ λαβοίμεθ', εὐτυχοῖμεν ἄν,  
εἴ ποθεν ἄελπτος παραπέσοι σωτηρία  
κτανοῦσι μὴ θανοῦσιν. εὔχομαι τάδε.  
ὅς βούλομαι γὰρ ἥδν καὶ διὰ στόρα  
πτηνοῖσι μύθοις ἀδαπάνως τέρψαι φρένα.

'Ἐρός in l. 1172 might be either neuter or masculine. If it is neuter, the second *εἰ* clause presumably defines its meaning: 'for if we attained one end—

<sup>1</sup> If they are an adscript, the original context though I will not urge that as a reason in favour may have contained the missing subject of *χαλᾶ*, of the hypothesis,

if somehow we might slay and then be saved from death ourselves—we should be fortunate.' If on the other hand it is masculine and refers to Menelaus, then the sense must be (in Mr. Wedd's words) : 'for if we were to escape after the murder, then it would be true that if we killed only one enemy we should be lucky enough.' As a sequel to the sentiment 'I must die, but I will be avenged on Menelaus first,' the renderings leave little to choose in absurdity and inconsequence. Mr. Wedd therefore proposes to regard *εὐτυχοῖμεν ἀντί* as ironical, 'we should indeed be lucky if . . .,' that is to say 'it is impossible that . . .'; and, taking *ἐνός* to be neuter, he paraphrases: 'I will die in punishing Menelaus; die, I say, for there is one thing too good to be true, i.e. that I should both punish Menelaus and escape myself.' Against this suggestion it may, I think, be urged that the proposed interpretation of *εὐτυχοῖμεν ἀντί* requires a good deal more support than the passages Mr. Wedd quotes, and that the logical connexion looks a good deal better in Mr. Wedd's paraphrase than it does in Euripides. The contrast between life and death makes all the difference, and Euripides has contrasted not life and death, but death noble and ignoble.

The difficulties of the passage, as it seems to me, mostly disappear if for the comma at the end of 1172 we substitute a colon or full-stop, and then regard l. 1173 as a wish. 'I will die nobly and be revenged on Menelaus; for if we get hold of one we shall be lucky. Would that it were possible to combine vengeance and escape. That is my *prayer*, which I utter for the pleasure utterance gives, though I know it cannot be realized.' What Orestes explains in 1172 is why he limits his proposed reprisals to Menelaus when there are Tyndareos and others who also deserve punishment. In 1173 he contrasts the ideal dénouement with the unfortunate circumstances of which he must now make the best. I have not noted a wish introduced by *εἴ ποθέν*, but *εἴ* alone in wishes occurs in Euripides (e.g. *Hec.* 836), and to this particular wish *ποθέν* is an almost necessary addition. Still, if anyone objects to a wish so introduced, a possible alternative is to treat 1173 as a conditional sentence in which some such apodosis as *ἀμεινον ἀντί εἰη* is replaced anacoluthically by *εὐχομαι τάδε*.

In the paraphrase just given I have treated *ἐνός* as masculine; it might, with the proposed punctuation, be either masculine or neuter, and neither view is free from difficulty. If it is neuter, then *ἐνός λαβέσθαι* for *ἐν λαβεῖν* is, as Wecklein says, remarkable. If it is masculine, then there is force in Mr. Wedd's objection that *prima facie* this implies an intention to do Menelaus personal violence, whereas Orestes's scheme is in fact to requite Menelaus by the murder of Helen. On the whole I prefer to regard it as masculine, and to suppose (with Paley) that *λαβέσθαι* is used in an extended and figurative sense.

A. S. F. Gow.

## THE LYRCEIAN WATER.

### A PASSAGE IN APOLLONIUS.

THERE is a passage of considerable difficulty in Apollonius, i. 124 :

ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ ἔιε βάξιν ἀγειρομένων ἡρώων,  
νεῖον ἀπ' Ἀρκαδίης Λυρκήιον Ἀργος ἀμείψας  
τὴν ὁδὸν ἡ ζωὸν φέρε κάπριον, ὃς δ' ἐνὶ βήσσῃς  
φέρθετο Λαμπεῖης Ἐρυμάνθιον ἀμ μέγα τέφος,  
τὸν μὲν ἐνὶ πρώτησι Μυκηναίων ἀγορῆσιν  
δεσμοῖς ἀλλόμενον μεγάλων ἀπεθήκατο νώτων,  
αὐτὸς δ' ἡ ιότητι παρὲκ νόον Εύρυσθῆος  
ώρμηθη.

Heracles had gone to Arcadia to fetch the Erymanthian boar; when he had just returned he heard of the voyage of Argo, and, hastily depositing the boar at Mycenae, departed to join Jason without the knowledge of Eurystheus. *Λυρκήιον Ἀργος ἀμείψας* is supposed to mean 'having come to Lyrcean Argos.' But, first, *ἀμείβω* *"Argos* ought not to mean 'I come to Argos'; *ἀμείβω* and *ἀμείβομαι* alike mean either *change* or *pass* or *leave*; *enter* they do not mean. The lexica quote passages as meaning *enter* which do not mean any such thing; *θύρας* or *βαλὸν ἀμείβω* is 'I pass the door or threshold,' *πόλιν ἐκ πόλεως ἀμείβω* or *ἀμείβομαι* is 'I change one city for another,' *ἀμείβομαι ἔρκος ὁδόντων* 'I pass the hedge of the teeth,' and so on. Until I see an instance of it I shall not believe that *πόλιν ἀμείβω* can mean merely 'I enter or come to a city.' Nor can we take it to mean 'pass' in this place, because the road from Arcadia to Mycenae does not pass Argos. Secondly, what is 'Lyrcean Argos'? Whether a river or a mountain be implied by 'Lyrcean,' it is not a Greek expression; we do not speak of Hymettian Athens or Cephisian Athens, of Cithaeronian or Asopian Thebes or Boeotia. There is indeed found the expression *Πηλιώτιν Ἰωλκὸν* in Euripides, *Medea* 484, and the scholiast on iv. 131 says that *Τιτηνίδος Αἴης* means 'Aea of the river Titon,' referring to Eratosthenes as his authority for the river, but no one else knows anything about it, and it is more than probable that Mr. Mooney is right in regarding it with suspicion. Thirdly, Heracles did not go to Argos, for he turned aside on the road that Eurystheus might not interfere with his joining Jason. But are we concerned with a river or a mountain, or was it perhaps both? The scholiast says: *ἀπὸ ὄρους Ἀργείου ἀκουστέον, ἀφ' οὐ Ἰναχος καταφέρεται ποταμὸς.* Statius *Theb.* iv. 117, 711 makes it a river, mentioning it along with

Lerna and Inachus. Ovid *Met.* i. 597, 'Iam pascua Lernae | consitaque arboribus Lyrcea reliquerat arua,' rather seems to think of it as a river, since as such it goes better with watery Lerna and with 'arua consita arboribus.' Strabo, Hesychius, Steph. Byz., only know it as a mountain. Thus the Greek authority, and the best on every ground, says a mountain, and I believe the Latin poets, at least Statius and probably Ovid, made a mistake in taking it for a river. And I think they may have drawn their water partly from this very source.

How so? Why should *Λυρκήιον Ἀργος* suggest a river? It did not; but then neither did Apollonius write *Λυρκήιον Ἀργος*. We have seen that this line is excessively suspicious on three distinct grounds: *ἀμείψας* would most naturally mean 'passing,' the epithet is no epithet for a city, and Heracles neither went to nor passed Argos on this journey. The scholiast gives us a hint; why should he add the words *ἀφ' οὐ Ἰνάχος καταφέρεται ποταμός*? Because what Apollonius said was that Heracles had just passed the Inachus, as he would or might do on his way back from Erymanthus to Mycenae.

To come to the point, Apollonius said *Λυρκήιον ἄρδος*, the Lyrcean waters. I could never have hit upon this if Mr. Wyse had not some five-and-twenty years ago imparted to me a most beautiful emendation of his, which he allows me here to publish, in the first line of Eurip. *Electra*: *ώ γῆς παλαιὸν ἄρδος*. There also *ἄρδος* became *Ἀργος*. About the immense superiority of Mr. Wyse's suggestion to any others proposed there can hardly be two opinions; the word *ἄρδος* is unimpeachably formed, and if it has perished off the face of the earth that is no wonder; the same fate has befallen other rare words beyond doubt. And Euripides adds the explanation, *Ίνάχου ρόας*; Apollonius thus is here simply echoing Euripides, and the two corrections confirm one another.

But now, to clinch the matter yet closer, let us see what Steph. Byz. says: *ὅρος Ἀργος. Καλλίμαχος Ἐκάλη. τὸ τοπικὸν Λύρκειον ὕδωρ καὶ Λυρκήιον.* We can hardly be wrong in following Meineke and supposing the 'Lyrcean water' to come from Callimachus, and this also supports strongly my theory that Apollonius was here referring to the river. The Inachus then is thus described by the poets:

Eurip. *γῆς παλαιὸν ἄρδος.*

Callim. *Λυρκήιον (?) ὕδωρ.*

Apoll. *Λυρκήιον ἄρδος.*

It is no wonder, if this be so, that the Latin poets were misled into inventing an imaginary river.

ARTHUR PLATT.

## NOTES ON HIEROCLES STOICVS.

'Ηθικὴ στοιχείωσις Column 2. 27.

The bear, says Hierocles, is aware that its head is easily injured, and instinctively uses its paws as a protection. The three following lines in the papyrus are badly damaged—κὰν εὶ π. ε . . . δεηθεῖη τοῦ | βαλανείου <lacuna of twenty letters> κρημνοῦ | πάλιν ὑπ <nineteen letters> ἐφίησιν ἐ | αυτήν. This is followed by a description of what the bear does when it is pursued and comes to a precipice. It inflates itself (ἀσκῷ ποιήσασα πεπνευματωμένῳ παραπλησίᾳ) and trusts to the inflation to break its fall. It is hardly possible to restore the damaged lines. Von Arnim thinks that the sense required is: 'wenn die Bärin, vom Jäger verfolgt, eines Bades bedarf oder auf ihrer Flucht an einen Abgrund kommt, πάλιν ὑπ<οστρέψασα ἐπὶ τοὺς διώκοντας> ἐφίησιν ἑαυτήν.' But a sensible bear would hardly think of taking a bath when pursued by the hunter. It might take to the water; but the Greek for this would be somewhat different. As I read the passage, there is no reference to the bear as pursued by the hunter till line 34, where I would read ποιεῖ δὲ τὸ τούονδε <διωκομένη>, since the phrase εὶ δ' οὐν διωκομένη in line 38 is resumptive, and implies that the pursuit must have been alluded to before. But before line 35 H. is only describing what the bear does to protect its head in the ordinary routine of its life when it is not harassed by the hunter. It wants a bath, and finds that it cannot reach the water without clambering down an overhanging bank (κρημνός). It will not climb down head foremost, but guards its head by sliding backwards down the bank. As the bear would want its bath because it was hot, it is perhaps not too hazardous to conjecture that some phrase such as κὰν εὶ π<ε>ε<ζομένη πνύγει> δεηθεῖη τοῦ β. should find its place in line 31.

*Ibid.* 5. 13.

τά τε ἔλκη φυλάττομεν ἀπρόσκρουστα καὶ τάθλητα κοιμάμενοι βαθέως.

Hierocles is discussing the consciousness of self which all living things possess (4. 58 συναισθάνεται δ' οὖν ἑαυτοῦ τὸ ζῶον), and is enforcing his argument—not very effectively—by appealing to the reflex actions of the human body when asleep. Thus we guard a wounded part from being knocked. The reading of the papyrus, ἄθλητα, presents us with an unknown and doubtful word. The papyrus is a private copy and not free from mistakes, cf. col. 2. 59 where ἐπιτίνοντα is written for ἐπιγνοῦντα. Accordingly we need not hesitate to correct what is probably a slip of the pen. Crönert in his Lexicon s.v.

suggests that the reading should be *ἀθικτα*. Should it not rather be *ἀθλιπτα* —a word used by Galen? We guard a wound from being knocked or chafed.

*Ibid.* 4. 54.

*Μαρτύρια δὲ . . . πιστὰ τῶν λόγων τὰ συμβαίνοντα.*

Von Arnim will not allow *ἀξιόπιστα* to fill the lacuna in the papyrus. Perhaps *οὐκ ἀπιστα*. Hierocles is fond of the double negative, e.g. *οὐ χειρον* 1. 2; *οὐκ ἀγνοητέον* 6. 10; *οὐκ ἀν* *ἀκαίρως* 7. 51; *οὐκ ἀνεντρεχεῖς* 50. 22.

F. W. HALL.

A

Aene  
these  
litera  
any v  
Verg  
book  
that  
migh  
entire

Italy  
in th  
felt t  
begin  
form  
supp  
Georg  
some

<sup>1</sup> Re  
logical  
Wedn  
<sup>2</sup> W  
Classi  
<sup>3</sup> T

## AN ATTEMPT TO DATE THE COMPOSITION OF *AENEID VII.*<sup>1</sup>

THE following notes have been made during a long-continued study of *Aeneid* vii. (and viii.), with a constantly growing conviction of the priority of these books in point of composition. They deal with internal evidence and literary correspondences only. Examination of the metre has not produced any very definite results, so when I noted in one of the most recent articles on Vergilian metre<sup>2</sup> the statement that 'a comparison and analysis of the separate books of the *Aeneid* does not give any results worthy of note' (with an exception that has not much bearing on this investigation), it seemed that these notes might appear without further waiting, though their argument is almost entirely subjective.

The passages from book vii. follow in the order of their occurrence.

vii. 44, 45.                    *maior rerum mihi nascitur ordo ;*  
                                  *maiis opus moueo.*

All commentators find some difficulty in this; how could the warfare in Italy compare with the fall of Troy, or with Aeneas's tremendous experiences in the underworld? It is possible to say, of course, that Vergil as an Italian felt that the war in Italy was the culmination of the life of Aeneas and the beginning of the mighty history of Rome, and that therefore books vii.-xii. form a *maiis opus* than i.-vi.; but all trouble would be avoided if we could suppose book vii. to be the first work taken in hand after the completion of the *Georgics*.<sup>3</sup> Prof. Ridgeway, in an article in a recent *Classical Quarterly*,<sup>4</sup> gives some slight support to this. He quotes lines 37 sqq.:

nunc age, qui reges, Erato, quae tempora rerum,  
                                  . . . . .  
                                  . . . . .  
expadiam, et primae reuocabo exordia pugnae.  
tu uatem, tu, diua, mone,

<sup>1</sup> Read at the meeting of the American Philological Association, at Haverford College, on Wednesday, December 30, 1914.

<sup>2</sup> W. G. D. Butcher, 'The Caesura in Vergil,' *Classical Quarterly*, viii. p. 127.

<sup>3</sup> This was written before the appearance of

Prof. A. Gercke's *Die Entstehung der Aeneis*. I am glad to see that he takes *maior maius* to allude to the *Elegies* and *Georgics*, quoting in addition *Ecl. iv. 5, magnus ab integro saeclorum nascitur ordo* (pp. 74, 75).

<sup>4</sup> Vol. vi. p. 239.

and says, 'This passage is more in the true Homeric style [than the opening of the first book], for not only is there no obtrusive *ego*, but he piously invokes the Muse, which he had omitted to do in the opening of the work.' [Not quite true, as in line 8 of book i. Vergil does say, *Musa, mihi causas memora*, but this is much less elaborate than the exordium in book vii.] If book vii. was the opening of the work, the invocation to the Muse would be all the more in place. The well-known lines of Propertius (II. xxxiv. 65, 66)

cedite Romani scriptores, cedite Grai:  
nescio quid maius nascitur Iliade

may have a direct reference to this. The four preceding lines

Actia Vergilium custodis litora Phoebi  
Caesaris et fortis dicere posse rates, (sc. iuuet)  
qui nunc Aeneae Troiani suscitat arma  
iactaque Lauinis moenia litoribus.

clearly refer to *Aeneid* vii., viii.

These lines of Propertius, according to the Suetonian *Life*, were written very soon after Vergil began to write the *Aeneid*. They can be dated by other allusions in the poem to about 26 B.C. Butler *ad loc.* says, 'The fact that Propertius seems to allude to a passage in book viii. does not prove that the book was already written. The passage referred to may well have existed independently of the book, in which it was ultimately intended to be included.' This is of course quite true with regard to the episode of the Shield, but the lines

qui nunc Aeneae Troiani suscitat arma  
iactaque Lauinis moenia litoribus

would refer most naturally to book vii. and especially to the walls made by Aeneas on his first landing, e.g. vii. 157:

ipse humili designat moenia fossa,<sup>1</sup> cett.

<sup>1</sup> Prof. Gercke (l. c. chap. iv.) draws similar inferences from the lines of Propertius, but thinks (following Rothstein) that they also refer to the prooemium to book i.:

Arma virumque cano, *Troiae* qui primus ab  
oris  
Italiam fato profugus *Lauinaque* uenit  
*litora*, multum ille et terris iactatus et alto  
ui superum saeuiae memorem Iunonis ob iram,  
multa quoque et bello passus, dum conderet  
urbem  
in ferretque deos Latio, genus unde Latinum  
Albanique patres atque altae moenia Romae.  
(i. 1-7).

He would conclude therefore that 'im Jahre 26 v. Chr. Vergils *Aeneis* mit den Versen i. 1-7 + vii. 37 et seq. begann, und dass der Dichter die ersten drei oder vier Jahre seiner Arbeit an dem neuen Epos lediglich auf die Dichtung der römischen *Ilias* verwendet hat' (p. 76). This

seems very plausible, though it does not appear necessary to refer

iactaque Lauinis moenia litoribus

to the foundation of Lavinium, which does not occur in the existing epic, and therefore to suppose a later curtailment of Vergil's plan. The line quoted above (*Aen.* vii. 157) is enough to justify the reference in Propertius.

I might say here that I am unable to follow Prof. Gercke in his elaborate attempt to dissect the *Aeneid* and date its various portions, but I am in substantial agreement with chap. iv., so far as it deals with the priority of book vii. In chap. v. Prof. Gercke proceeds to analyze book vii. and the rest of the last half of the *Aeneid*, and to label the fragments 'alt,' 'jung,' etc. His judgments would in many cases run entirely counter to the literary considerations I have tried to bring forward in this paper.

## AN ATTEMPT TO DATE THE COMPOSITION OF *AENEID VII.* 89

Rothstein's<sup>1</sup> argument that Vergil copied Propertius in the *Aeneid*, while Propertius copied the *Georgics* and *Elegies*, does not seem convincing. One might profitably quote Prof. Wight Duff:<sup>2</sup> 'What baffles exhaustive disentanglement is the manifest interplay of genius. Professor Mackail cites the parallel of the *Lyrical Ballads* of 1798. The *Ancient Mariner* is Coleridge's, but it owes to Wordsworth elements which we definitely know, and others which we might guess but can never know. Similarly the Wordsworth of these *Ballads* is not entirely himself: he is in part Coleridge.'

A minor coincidence in English poetry is perhaps interesting. Wordsworth in the Prefatory Sonnet writes:

Bees that soar for bloom  
High as the highest Peak of Furness Fells,  
Will murmur by the hour in foxglove bells,

while Keats, in his sonnet 'O Solitude,' has,

Startles the wild bee from the foxglove bell.

Too much should not be made of these correspondences, but it seems to me that the lines of Propertius would suggest that before 26 B.C. he had heard read *Aen.* vii. and viii., and that therefore these books came early, if not earliest, in point of composition.

vii. 59-63. The description of the laurel in the midst of Latinus's palace may be compared with the laurel in Priam's palace, ii. 512-514. Note that there are five lines in book vii. as opposed to three in book ii. Also note that in vii. there immediately follows the prodigy of the swarm of bees (*densae*, l. 64.), and in ii. the simile of the doves (*condensae*, l. 517). Also *altaria* in the same place in the line, and with elision before it follows in both passages.

vii. 71. *dum altaria taedis*].

ii. 515. *neququam altaria circum*. |

vii. 71-77. (Lavinia's hair catching fire) may also be compared with ii. 681-686 (of Ascanius). There are seven lines in book vii. to six in book ii. The resemblance in *wording* is not very close, but vii. 72. *iuxta genitorem* may be compared with

ii. 681. *manus inter maestorumque ora parentum*.  
and vii. 75. *ac-censa comas* with

ii. 684. *flamma comas*, where *comas* appears in the same place in the line. Also *subitum* appears in vii. 67, and in ii. 680.

106-115. I have referred in a note in the *Classical Review*<sup>3</sup> to the close resemblance between these lines, which describe the landing of the Trojans at the mouth of the Tiber, and the first meal eaten on shore, and those in the first book (especially lines 169, 173, 177-8) dealing with their similar experience in

<sup>1</sup> *Hermes* xxiv. (1889) 1-34.

<sup>2</sup> *Literary History of Rome*, p. 487.

<sup>3</sup> *Class. Rev.* xx. 113 *et seq.*

Africa; and to the conflation of the two passages by Ovid.<sup>1</sup> For the present purpose it will suffice to note that two striking words *Cereale . . . Cererem.* vii. 111, 113, are brought into a single line in i. 177,

tum *Cererem* corruptam undis *Cerealiaque arma*  
expeditunt.

I shall try to show the significance of this later.

109-129. The impossibility of harmonizing this passage—the eating of the tables—with the prophecy in book iii. 250-257 is well known; and the same difficulties occur in the story of the white sow in book viii., where no reference is made to the prophecy of Helenus, iii. 390 sqq. In book vii., when Aeneas accepts the omen, he refers the prophecy to Anchises, with four lines purporting to give his exact words. Now supposing this book to have been written first, before the poet had decided on the details of the earlier part of his story, Anchises was the obvious person to whom a prophecy of the future of the Trojans might be assigned. But is it conceivable that after writing the elaborate story of the Harpy in book iii., where Anchises himself prays for the omen to be averted, Vergil could 'by a curious slip' (Sidgwick *ad loc.*; Page calls it 'a clear oversight') attribute the prophecy to Anchises? Note too that the Harpy's curse is twice afterwards referred to in book iii.; Aeneas relates it to Helenus, and Helenus speaks of it in his reply.

I had noted this before reading Boissier<sup>2</sup> on the episode. He says: 'Il est donc vraisemblable que la prédiction des Harpies a été ajoutée plus tard par le poète. Je ne crois pas qu'il soit téméraire de supposer . . . que Virgile ne l'a fait que parce qu'il craignait le mauvais effet que pouvait produire son récit sur quelques lecteurs et qu'il voulait le justifier et les y préparer d'avance.' Above he remarks on the suitability of this rôle for the Harpies, 'vieilles divinités grecques, grossières et un peu grotesques.'

Heinze<sup>3</sup> draws from the fulfilment of these two prophecies in vii. and viii. conclusions similar to mine, though he is less concerned with the priority of vii. and viii. than with the late composition of iii. He concludes that at least some two-thirds of the whole poem had been composed when iii. was written. He thinks that Vergil wrote book iii. to fill up the gap between Troy and Carthage, and worked in the prodigies and prophecies with a single eye to the unity and artistic perfection of iii. without regard to the later books already written. This left much to alter in the later half; in vii. the whole account of the landing required reconstruction.

192-285. The general resemblance of the description of Ilioneus's missions to Latinus in book vii. and to Dido in book i. has been often enough noticed, but the passages will bear examination in detail.<sup>4</sup> I append a parallel table of the most striking resemblances, but one point may be referred to especially.

<sup>1</sup> *Metam.* xi. 119-124.

<sup>2</sup> *Nouvelles Promenades Archéologiques*, p. 272, n.

<sup>3</sup> *Virgils Epische Technik*, pp. 85-93.

<sup>4</sup> In the first book Aeneas appears, as well as

the sovereign and the ambassador, so the episode is longer and more elaborate. There are also parallels to the meeting with Euander in book viii.

AN ATTEMPT TO DATE THE COMPOSITION OF *AENEID VII.* 91

Compare vii. 249-250

talibus Ilionei dictis *defixa* Latinus  
obtutu tenet ora, soloque immobilis *haeret*

with i. 495,

dum stupet *obtutuque haeret defixus* in uno,

said of Aeneas just before the entrance of Dido and Ilioneus. Surely the line in the first book was written after those in vii., since it brings the three salient words of two lines together in the middle of a single line. Elsewhere<sup>1</sup> I have used a similar argument to support a proposed reading in Horace. In *Odes III. iv. 9, 10*, I would read

me *fabulosae* Voltare in Apulo  
nutricis extra limina *Dauniae*

(adopting Paldamus's conjecture, read by Ritter, for the corrupt *limen Apuliae*), and would support the emendation from *Odes I. xxii.*, where the three salient words are scattered through three stanzas (*fabulosus* l. 7, *Daunias* l. 14, *nutrix* l. 16). The parallelism of thought between the two passages, *Odes I. xxii.* and *Odes III. iv. 9-36*, is very striking. I quote this now because the date of the third book of the *Odes* is usually accepted as being later than that of the first book. In Vergil the dating of the books is the very point at issue, so the argument from analogy is of some value in attempting to argue that the condensed passage is the later.<sup>2</sup>

PARALLELS BETWEEN THE TWO EMBASSIES OF ILIONEUS.

*Aeneid* vii. 168-285.

- (1) 192-3. Latinus receives Trojans in a temple, of which a description and history has preceded.
- (2) 194. atque haec ingressis *placido* prior edidit ore (of Latinus).
- (3) 195-6. neque enim *nescimus* et *urbem* | et *genus*.
- (4) 197-8. Latinus asks questions.
- (5) 205. *Atque* *equidem* *memini* (Latinus). [Latinus's first speech seventeen lines, second fifteen lines.]
- (6) 213-248. Ilioneus's speech thirty-six lines (including a half line).
- (7) 234-5. siue fide, seu quis bello est expertus et armis [of Aeneas].

*Aeneid* i. 441-655.

- 505-6. Dido . . .
- 520-1. Postquam introgressi . . . *placido* sic pectore coepit (of Ilioneus).
565. Quis genus Aeneadum, quis Troiae nesciat urbem?
- 539-540. Ilioneus . . .
619. *Atque* *equidem* *Teucrum* *memini* (Dido). [Dido's first speech seventeen lines, second sixteen.] [Compare also viii. 157 nam *memini*. (Euander).]<sup>3</sup>
- 522-558. Ilioneus's speech thirty-seven lines (including a half line).
- 544-5. quo iustior alter | nec pietate fuit nec bello maior et armis [of Aeneas].

episode: note especially viii. 171:

auxilio laetos dimittam opibusque iuuabo

compared with i. 571:

auxilio tutos dimittam opibusque iuuabo.

<sup>1</sup> *Class. Rev.* xx. 304 sq.

<sup>2</sup> See note above, *Cereale* . . . *Cererem*, vii. 111, 113.

<sup>3</sup> There are various parallels with the Euander

(8) Gifts (especially <i>gestamen</i> 246 [compare iii. 286 (of Aeneas), magni <i>gestamen</i> Abantis]).	647-655. Gifts (especially <i>quod gesserat</i> 653).
(9) 249-250. <i>defixa . . . obtutu . . . haeret</i> (Latinus).	495. <i>obtutuque haeret defixus</i> (Aeneas).
(10) 263-6. Wish for Aeneas.	575-6. ditto.
(11) 278. <i>monilia</i> .	654. <i>monile</i> (only places in Vergil except <i>Ciris</i> , 170).
(12) 278-9. <i>aurea . . . auro . . . aurum</i> .	448-9. <i>aerea . . . aere . . . aenis</i> . (Compare also iv. 138-9, xi. 774-6.)

286-322. It is in this passage that perhaps the most instructive parallelism with book i. occurs. A comparison of Juno's soliloquy here with that in the first book will bring out some striking points. One might argue again that the shorter passage is the later—thirteen lines in book i. as opposed to thirty in book vii. The use of elision is very marked in both, as is natural in a passionate speech, but while in book vii. there are twenty-one elisions in thirty lines, a high proportion, in book i. there are fourteen elisions in thirteen lines, i.e. more than one a line. I imagine this would be difficult to parallel; as compared with the passage in book vii. the speech seems raised to the *n<sup>th</sup>* power of condensed fury.

In book vii. *two* divinities, Mars and Diana, are mentioned as having gratified their lust for vengeance by the punishment of whole peoples, in contrast to Juno herself, who cannot get revenge upon Aeneas. In book i. the one goddess Pallas, Juno's partner in the war (*Horace, Odes* III. iii. 22, 23), is used to point the contrast by her success in punishing Ajax. The comparison seems much happier.<sup>1</sup>

Note further that while in each case Juno has recourse to the aid of a subordinate deity, the Aeolus incident seems worked out in a more satisfactory way than the one with the Fury; at least, the way in which Aeolus produces the storm

cauum conuersa cuspide montem  
impulit in latus *cett*.

has less of magic in it than the tale of the snake hurled at Amata or the firebrand at Turnus. The snake episode is very curious. Vergil seems to have hovered between the idea of a real and of a figurative snake. His account of the infusion of the poison is pure magic :

ille inter uestes et leuia pectora lapsus  
uoluitur attactu nullo, **FALLIT**que furentem  
*uipereum INSPIRANS animam.* (349-351)

<sup>1</sup> It is perhaps worth while to note that each passage begins with a reference to Sicily :

vii. 298-9,

et *laetum* Aeneam classemque ex aethere longe  
Dar daniam *Sicul*o *prospexit* ab usque Pachyno.

i. 34, 35.

*uix e conspectu Siculae telluris in altum  
uela dibant laeti.*

The chiastic arrangement (*LAETUM . . . SICULO  
PROSPEXIT, CONSPETUS SICULAE . . . LAETI*) seems  
to indicate that the correspondence is not accidental.

## AN ATTEMPT TO DATE THE COMPOSITION OF AENEID VII. 93

Compare this with the highly-finished account of Dido and Cupid in i. 657-722, especially 685-688 :

ut, cum te gremio accipiet laetissima Dido  
regales inter mensas laticemque Lyaeum,  
cum dabit amplexus atque oscula dulcia figet,  
occultum INSPIRES ignem FALLASQUE ueneno.

Grant the existence of Cupid, and the process of infection is quite scientific. Note also *inspires* and *fallas* brought into the same line, as opposed to *fallit* . . . *inspirans* in vii. 350, 351; also the bold construction of *fallas ueneno* in contrast to the simple Graecism *fallit inspirans*.<sup>1</sup>

The magical element in the firebrand passage (vii. 413-459) is less marked, because the Fury appears to Turnus in his sleep (414, 427, 458), and the mixture of sleeping and waking in the story makes it less needful to inquire whether she hurls at him dream torches or real ones—

sic effata facem iuueni coniecit et atro  
lumine fumantes fixit sub pectore taedas,  
olli somnum ingens rumpit pauor. (456-8)

376-7 tum uero *infelix* ingentibus excita monstris  
immensum sine more *furit lymphata per urbem*.

said of Amata.

Compare iv. 68-69 :

uritur *infelix* Dido totaque uagatur  
*urbe furens*.

Notice again that the passage in book iv. is shorter.<sup>2</sup>

The resemblance has of course often enough been pointed out; it is quoted here in support of the main argument. Note too that in book iv. there follows the lovely simile of the wounded deer; here the grotesque one of the top. Observe especially vii. 382, *uolubile buxum*; iv. 71, *uolatile ferrum*.

The word *lymphata* does not occur elsewhere in Vergil (it occurs in Horace, *Odes* I. xxxvii. 14), but it is found in Catullus, lxiv. 254, in a passage which Vergil imitates in his account of the Bacchic frenzy of Amata, 384-403:

<sup>1</sup> I have noted a number of passages where an author's bold construction seems a case of 'going one better' than himself in a previous passage, or the predecessor he is imitating. E.g. would Horace have written *curis . . . expeditis*, *Odes* I. xxii. 11, if it had not been for *solutis . . . curis*, Catullus xxxi. 7, 2? Again, perhaps 'mibi cumque value | rite uocanti' (*Odes* I. xxxii. 15, 16) can best be explained as a further experimentation of Horace in the use of the participles, led up to by *quippe . . . reuisens* in the preceding ode

(ll. 13, 14), which is of course modelled on *έπει* in Greek with the participle.

<sup>2</sup> Nettleship (*Verg.* p. 131) has already pointed out that Amata in the last six books plays a part somewhat similar to that of Dido in i. and iv., but the idea of Amata as understudy to Dido will bear more emphasis. Vergil's treatment of Amata is distinctly unsympathetic, in great contrast to his portrait of Dido. But compare Mr. Garrod's remarks on the way Dido outgrew the original intention of her creator (*English Literature and the Classics*, pp. 150 sqq.).

per medias urbes agitur populosque feroceſ.  
quin etiam in silvas, *simulato* numine Bacchi,  
maius adorta nefas, maioremque orſa *furorem*,  
euolat, . . . . .

389 *euhoe, Bacche*, fremens, ſolum te uirgine dignum  
uociferans: etenim molles tibi ſumere *thyrſos*,  
te lustrare choro, ſacrum tibi paſcere crinem,

395 Ast aliae tremulis ululatibus aethera complent,  
pampineasque gerunt incinctae pellibus hastas.  
*ipsa* inter *medias* flagrantem feruida pinum  
ſuſtinet . . . . .

403 'Solute crinales uitias, capite *orgia* mecum.'

Further on 580, 581:

tum, quorum attonitae Baccho nemora auia matres  
insultant *thiasis*.<sup>1</sup>

Compare Catullus lxiv. 251 sqq.:

at parte ex alia florens uolitabat Iacchus  
cum *thiaso* Satyrorum et Nysigenis Silenis,  
te quaerens, Ariadna, tuoque *incensus* amore,  
quicum alacres passim *lymphata* mente *turebant*  
*euhoe bacchantes*, *euhoe* capita inflectentes.  
horum pars tecta quatiebant *thyrſos*.

  . . . .  
pars obscura cauis celebabant *orgia* ciftis,  
*orgia*, quae fruſtra cupiunt audire profani, cett.

I quote this because I would suggest that Vergil in the passage in book vii. had Catullus's lines in mind (I have noted several other reminiscences of poem lxiv. in *Aeneid* vii.; compare Horace's imitations of Catullus xi. in his first Sapphic ode). Then in the more highly finished lines in book iv. he improved on both himself and Catullus, both in iv. 68-69 already quoted, and in another highly condensed passage in which every word tells:

iv. 300-303,

saeuit inops animi totamque *incensa per urbem*  
*bacchatur*, qualis commotis *excita sacris* (cp. vii. 376)

<sup>1</sup> *Thiasus* is not used elsewhere in Vergil,  
except in *Bucolics* v. 30, 31:

*thiasos inducere Bacchi*  
*et foliis lentaſ intexere mollibus hastas.*

Thyias, ubi auditu stimulant trieterica Baccho  
 orgia,<sup>1</sup> nocturnusque uocat clamore Cithaeron.

Vergil has used and condensed this material also in vi. 517-519 (again of a wife deceiving her husband, like Amata), where Deiphobus says of Helen on the last night of Troy :

illa chorum simulans euantes orgia circum  
 ducebant Phrygias; flammam media ipsa tenebat  
 ingentem.

Norden *ad loc.* comments that *euantes* seems to be taken from Catullus. I should prefer to say that in the lines from book vii. Vergil imitated Catullus closely (especially compare vii. 389, *euhoe, Bacche, fremens*, with Catullus Ixiv. 255, *euhoe bacchantes, euhoe*, in both cases at the head of the line). *Euhoe* does not occur elsewhere in Vergil, and *euantes* only in the passage just quoted from vi. Note the strained Greek construction of *euantes orgia*, and compare note on *fallas ueneno*, above.

With regard to lines

- 601-607 Mos erat Hesperio in Latio, quem protinus urbes  
 Albanae coluere sacrum, nunc maxima rerum  
 Roma colit, cum prima mouent in proelia Martem,  
 604 sie Getis inferre manu lacrimabile bellum  
 Hyrcanisue Arabisue parant, seu tendere ad Indos,  
 Auroramque sequi Parthosque reposcere signa.  
 607 sunt geminae Belli portae, *cett.*

editors have generally agreed that 606 at least was added later, as the standards were not recovered till 20 B.C. (though they were demanded in 23). So it may have been written by Vergil within a year of his death. I should be inclined however to think that 604-6 were all a late insertion by the poet, and that the passage originally read :

mos erat Hesperio in Latio, quem protinus urbes  
 Albanae coluere sacrum, nunc maxima rerum  
 Roma colit, cum prima mouent in proelia Martem.  
 sunt geminae Belli portae.

I would point out for what it may be worth that the four lines 602-5 have all of them a third trochaic caesura. I have not noted any other instance in the *Aeneid* of four consecutive lines with third trochaic caesuras (there are three, vii. 805-7); this may perhaps have some bearing on the question of later insertion, as the original passage would have had only two if my suggestion is correct.

[NOTE ON BOOK VIII.—I will not make here any detailed examination of book viii., but will only say, with much diffidence, that it appears to me that

<sup>1</sup> Compare *Georgics* iv. 521, 'nocturnique orgia Bacchi.'

viii. was composed continuously with vii., the two forming practically one episode, but that viii. has received much more careful polishing than vii. It may be noted that the picture in viii. 720 sqq. of Augustus seated in the temple of Apollo has perhaps more vividness if we suppose it to have been written soon after 28 B.C., when Augustus built the temple of Apollo on the Palatine. There are many parallels in these two books with Livy I., but they consist mainly in the subject matter. It is worth while to compare Livy and Propertius for the Cacus episode (*Aen.* viii. 185-268). Compare especially Livy I. 7, § 4: *loco herbido ut quiete et pabulo laeto reficeret boues et ipsum fessum uia procubuisse*  
with Propertius IV. ix. 4,

*et statuit fessos fessus et ipse boues.*

The poetical language used by Livy in this episode has often been noted; should we imagine that all three authors were drawing from a common original in verse?]

GERTRUDE HIRST.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

## TERGA FATIGAMVS HASTA.

WHEN we read the Latin Grammarians' Rules of Prosody, we are puzzled now and then. (They are to be found in the Prosody-sections of Keil's *Grammatici Latini*, and deal mainly with the Dactylic Hexameter and with Virgil.) One thing that puzzles us is their silence about the features of difference between Latin Prosody and Greek. They often seem to take it for granted that Virgil's Prosody is identical with Homer's. This point of view is perhaps not surprising, since these Grammatici often speak of Latin as a mere dialect of Greek (Charisius 292, 16 K. 'cum ab omni sermone Graeco Latina lingua pendere uideatur'; Diomede 311, 3 'cum ab omni sermone Graeco Latina loquella pendere uideatur'). But it has its disadvantages. Every schoolboy knows that *moenid̄ Troiae* is as natural in Virgil as *τείχεα Τροίης* would be unnatural in Homer; and every school-manual of Latin Prosody confines its examples of a Mute and Liquid (1) lengthening, (2) not lengthening a preceding syllable to examples of a Mute and Liquid in the middle of a word. If it mentions Catullus' *impotentiā freta*, it calls this a Greek, not a Latin type. Not so the Grammatici. Diomede's examples of a short syllable before FR, FL are (429, 3 K.):

ore fremebant  
talia flammato.

And we are puzzled by the arrangement of the rules for Lengthening by Position. The Grammatici, one and all, follow this procedure. They enumerate the letters which (1) contribute, (2) do not contribute to length by Position—in this style, appending nearly always the same pair of examples :

- R, L, N after a Mute, e.g. (1) etc., (2) etc.
- R, L after F, e.g. (1) etc., (2) etc.
- S, e.g. (1) unde spissa coma (by an unknown author).  
(2) ponite. spes sibi quisque.
- H, e.g. (1) terga fatigamus hasta.  
(2) hic vir, hic est.

The last item is the most puzzling of all. Why should the letter H be treated separately? There is nothing in Virgil's practice to justify this prominence being given to H. For Virgil and for his contemporaries and predecessors (including the Dramatists, *pace* Prof. Birt) there exists no distinction whatsoever, so far as Prosody is concerned, between an initial syllable which begins with H and one which begins with a vowel. No one, that is to say no one with unprejudiced mind, who reads through the Virgilian poems with a view to compiling rules of Virgilian Prosody would ever dream of selecting *terga fatigamus hasta* as illustrative of a peculiar type of lengthening 'in arsi.' He might with good reason make one type (a) 'lengthening at a pause in the sense,' e.g.

omnia uincit Amor—et nos cedamus Amori,

another type (b) 'lengthening at the Caesura of the line' (presumably justified by the genesis of the Hexameter out of two short lines), e.g.

dona dehinc auro grauiā | sectoque elephanto.

But the presence or absence of an initial H does not play any part in the lengthening. There is nothing that would suggest such an idea to the unprejudiced reader. This item of the ancient Rules of Prosody offers a puzzling problem.

And it is a problem worth solving. For we know that one of the features peculiar to the Later Latin verse of the Christian poets, is precisely this novel treatment of initial H. We may take the Prosody-section of Bede, *de Arte Metrica*, as a convenient summary of the Rules of Christian Latin Prosody. Bede says there (230, 27 K.): 'item natura breuis syllaba ad uotum poetarum transferri potest in longam, cum correpta uocalis in consonantem desinit et excipitur ab H littera: est enim natura breuis in hoc:

porcinum tenuere gregem, niger, hispidus, horrens ;  
est uoluntate poetae longa in hoc :  
uir humilis maesto deiectus lumine terram,  
et item mors fera per hominem miserum sibi subdidit orbem

Bede, who often contrasts favourably with the Grammarians of the Empire and refuses to join in some of their parrot-cries, adds a criticism of their example *terga fatigamus hasta*, pointing out that the presence or absence of H makes no difference to Virgil. But although his remark is just, there seems no reason to doubt that it was this Rule of Prosody in these Grammarians, supported by this example from Virgil, which caused the new departure in Christian Latin poetry. What other cause could there be? The pronunciation of H had not become more marked, more consonantal in course of time. On the contrary it had begun that process of weakening which ended in its being dropped altogether in pronunciation (e.g. French *homme*, Spanish *hombre*), if not also in writing (e.g. Italian *uomo*). Prof. Meyer-Lübke, the chief authority on the Romance languages, tells us that there is not any vestige in them of Latin H, however far back we go. 'Das H ist im Volksmunde schon gegen Ende der Republik völlig geschwunden.' What produced the change in Latin versification (an artificial thing, learned from Rules of Prosody as we learn to write Latin Verse) was this particular rule and nothing else, this rule which every student learned at school or college. What then was the cause of the rule?

I think I can supply the answer. The first compilation of rules for Latin Prosody was, I take it, made by a Greek, some 'Graeculus esuriens.' He did it in the way which gave him least trouble. He took some standard Greek manual of Rules of Prosody (based on Homer's poems) and merely translated them into Latin, substituting Latin examples from Virgil in place of the Greek

examples from Homer. Anyone who read through the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in order to frame Rules of Homeric Prosody would have to assign a separate paragraph to Homer's lengthening of a final syllable before what would then be called merely an initial Aspirate, but which we now with better knowledge would describe as an Aspirate which represents an original Digamma. This rule having been translated into Latin, the 'Graeculus esuriens' would hunt for an example in Virgil which could replace the Greek example (let us suppose Homer's *ἀρνύμενος ἥν*, where the Aspirate represents *σF*, as in Latin *suus*). When he ultimately found *terga fatigamus hasta*, down it would go, without further inquiry, into his translation; and he would turn, with a sigh of relief, to the next Greek rule. That is an imaginary description. Yes, but it tallies exactly with the actual features of these Latin Rules of Prosody. It explains, for instance, why the 'Mute and Liquid' examples are often more suitable to Greek Prosody than to Latin.

And it explains a supposed lacuna in Charisius (14, 9 K.). Charisius' list of letters which (1) contribute, (2) do not contribute to length by Position includes not merely the usual Liquid, S, H, etc., but also one excluded by the other Grammatici :

V, e.g. (1) inualidique patrum referunt ieunia nati, (2) *deest*.

Keil indicates a lacuna. But a reference to Priscian's more extended treatment of the question shews us that Charisius, who confines himself to the Dactylic Hexameter, deliberately withheld the example of V not contributing to length by Position, because it came from Terence. Charisius we may believe to have drawn from the same original as is more fully transcribed by Priscian. Priscian (p. 16, K.), in an extremely interesting account of the Aeolic Digamma, says: 'est quando in metris pro nihilo accipiebant, ut:

ἀμὲς δ' Φειρήναντ το δε γαρ θετο Μῶσα λίγεια

(where it does not prevent elision of the vowel of δέ); est enim hexametrum heroicum. Apud Latinos quoque hoc idem inuenitur pro nihilo in metris, et maxime apud uetustissimos comicorum, ut Terentius in *Andria*:

Sine inuidia laudem inuenias et amicos pares;

est enim iambicum trimetrum.'

Here too the rule has the same genesis. It is a rule originally of Greek (Aeolic) Prosody. For Latin students of Prosody the same rule is utilized, and an example of it is found, by hook or by crook, in Latin poetry.

I think we may fairly accept this version of the facts, and believe that the actual cause of the new feature of Christian Latin poetry, a scansion like 'per hominem,' was immediately the manual of Latin Prosody used by students — 'argilla quiduis imitaberis uda' — and ultimately the careless blunder of a Greek pedant.

W. M. LINDSAY.

## NOTES ON LUCAN I. AND VIII.

### I. 167-170:

tunc longos iungere fines  
agrorum et quondam duro sulcata Camilli  
uomere et antiquos Curiorum passa ligones  
longa sub ignotis extendere rura colonis.

THIS well-known passage refers to the growth of *latifundia*, a symptom of Rome's decadence. In v. 170 *ignotis* is generally taken to mean 'unknown to the owners,' and thus, it seems to me, the point of the passage is missed. There is a double antithesis; *longa* is contrasted with *breuia*, *parua*, and *ignotis* with *notis*, *inlustribus*, or the like. The latter antithesis is implied in *Camilli*, *Curiorum*; the other is left to be understood. In the good old days farms were small, but were cultivated by the most eminent citizens, men like Camillus and Curius Dentatus; now these small farms are combined to form *latifundia*, managed by nobodies (*ignotis*), whether slaves or tenant farmers. The juxtaposition of *longa* and *sub ignotis* is intentional.

No one who knows Lucan will be troubled by the repetition *longos—longa* (See *C.Q.* VIII., p. 111).

### I. 291-295—The effect of Curio's speech on Caesar:

sic postquam fatus, et ipsi  
in bellum prono tantum tamen addidit irae  
accenditque ducem, quantum clamore iuuatur  
Eleus sonipes, quamuis iam carcere clauso  
immineat foribus pronusque repagula laxet.

The last two lines of this passage have caused some trouble, though the general sense is quite clear. The eager racehorse is pictured as stretching his head over the top of the barrier and impatiently striving to burst open the door. Hosius in his first edition printed his own conjecture *pedibus* for *pronus*, and he has been followed by Lejay. The emendation was suggested by Ov. *Met.* II. 155 *pedibusque repagula pulsant*, and the 'correctors' of some of our MSS. actually give us *pulset* for *laxet* in the above passage of Lucan. But Lucan must be allowed some originality even in his imitations, and in any case it is not easy to see why a scribe should have changed *pedibus* to *pronus*. As Hosius still thinks his conjecture worthy of mention in the *apparatus*, it appears that the meaning of *pronus* is not quite clearly understood. It may be well,

therefore, to cite Stat. *Th.* X. 509 sqq.: tandem umeris obnixus Acron et pectore toto | pronus Achaemenides ferratae robora portae | torserunt. Here, as in Lucan, *pronus* means 'throwing his weight forward,' 'pushing hard.' Lucan has such a habit of repeating words at short intervals that the occurrence of *prono* in v. 292 is actually a confirmation of the reading *pronus* in v. 295.

Francken finds it impossible to accept the traditional reading *iam carcere clauso*, owing to the difficulty of taking *iam* with *immineat* when it would naturally go with *clauso*. This objection comes unexpectedly from the editor of a poet, especially of a poet such as Lucan. In III. 184 sq. we find *iam dilecta Ioui centenis uenit in arma | Creta uetus populis*, where *iam* goes with *uenit*, not with *dilecta*; yet Francken finds no fault with the reading. *Semper* is similarly used in III. 21: *semperque potentis | detrahere in cladem fato damnata maritos | innupsit . . .*; here *semper* goes, not with *potentis*, but with the main verb. To pass from temporal adverbs, we find a still more awkward use of *paene* in V. 242, *cum paene fideles . . . manus destituere ducem*; cf. Hor. *C. III. 6. 13*. We may compare also the use of *frustra*, IX. 952. Lucan seems to take a malicious delight in placing *non* ambiguously before an adjective when it really modifies the verb or the whole sentence, e.g. I. 339, 455, V. 541, VI. 107, 120, 166, VII. 44. He also has *iam* in stranger positions than it occupies in the instances cited above, e.g. IV. 652, *Alcides medio tenuit iam pectora pigro | stricta gelu*, where *iam* modifies *stricta*. Nor is Lucan alone in his treatment of this word.

I. 303 sqq.—Caesar tells his soldiers of the preparations which are being made to resist him :

non secus ingenti bellorum Roma tumultu  
concutitur quam si Poenus transcenderit Alpes  
Hannibal : implentur ualidae tirone cohortes ;  
in classem cadit omne nemus ; terraque marique  
iuussus Caesar agi.

The reading *uvalidae* is much better supported than *uvalido*. Lejay, who, like Francken, rightly refuses to take *implentur* in the sense of *augentur*, explains *uvalidae* with good reason as an instance of *Prolepsis*, but he does not tell us why Pompey's *tirones* are said by Caesar to make strong cohorts. Francken (who, however, reads *uvalido*) talks of the *robusta rustica iuuentus*, and thinks that Caesar is wilfully exaggerating the gravity of the preparations which are being made by his enemies. But that is precisely what Caesar does not wish to do, and does not do : see vv. 311 sqq.: *ueniat longa dux pace solitus | milite cum subito partesque in bella togatae*, etc. The preparations are represented as being brisk and noisy, but not formidable. Surely *uvalidae tirone* is a contradiction in terms, used with grim irony. Pompey, says Caesar, is busily raising fresh forces—fine, strong battalions—of raw recruits ! For other instances of the ironical use of adjectives in Lucan, see V. 227, *en improba uota ! IX. 1108, O bona libertas !*

## I. 540-544:

ipse caput medio Titan cum ferret Olympo,  
condidit ardentes atra caligine currus  
inuoluitque diem; qualem fugiente per ortus  
sole Thyestae noctem duxere Mycenae.

The mythological allusion in vv. 543 sq. does not require explanation, but the precise meaning of the lines has been the subject of dispute. Francken objects to *duxere*, and reads *induxere* (sc. *sibi*). 'Non agitur,' he says, 'de longa h.l. sed de alta caligine.' But it is surely quite natural to compare the darkness at Rome, when the gloom of night 'enshrouded the day,' with the prolonged night inflicted on Mycenae. In each case night usurped the place of day. *Qualem . . . noctem duxere Mycenae* means 'twas like the prolonged night which Mycenae suffered,' not 'twas like the night Mycenae prolonged.' *Ducere* often means, not 'to protract,' or 'to prolong,' but 'to experience a prolongation of,' or 'to endure for a long time.' Such must be the meaning here, for if we take *duxere Mycenae* in the sense of 'Mycenae prolonged' (by its crime), we shall have to adopt an unnatural view of *fugiente per ortus sole*; the crime of Atreus' feast surely occurred before the punishment, not simultaneously with it! The same objection applies with perhaps even greater force to Francken's *induxere*, which will be intelligible only if we take *fugiente . . . sole* as an attribute of *noctem*, a construction which cannot be called impossible, but which is less simple and natural than the other. Thus there is no need to alter the traditional text.

## I. 688-690:

nunc desuper Alpis  
nubiferae colles atque aeriam Pyrenen  
abripimur.

These words are uttered by the Roman matron who in a state of inspired frenzy seems to be carried through the air to the various parts of the world where the chief events of the Civil War are destined to happen. First she is snatched away in spirit *super aethera*, and as she feels herself being lowered to earth she exclaims (678 sq.):

quo feror, O Paean? qua me super aethera raptam  
constituis terra?

She is wafted to the region of Pharsalia, to Egypt, and then to Libya; from Libya she is borne away to the Alps and to the Pyrenees, where she beholds fresh horrors.

The use of *desuper* in v. 688 is very puzzling. The prevalent view seems to be that the word is used as a preposition with the sense and construction of *super*. This use would be absolutely unique, and probability and reason are entirely against it. On the other hand, if we take *desuper* as an adverb and *colles* as Acc. of Motion To (like *Syrtim* and *Libyen* in the preceding sentence),

we are faced with the question why the woman is said to go *down* from Africa to the Alps and the Pyrenees. Emendation has, of course, been attempted, but the results have not been encouraging. Lemaire supposes that as the matron is carried from place to place *super aethera* (v. 678, already quoted) she would of course land on the Alps from above (*desuper*). This is true enough, but it is not what Lucan makes the woman say. If the verb modified by *desuper* were *aduenimus*, such an explanation would hold good, but the verb unfortunately is *abripimur*, 'I am being snatched away' (from Africa). It would seem, then, that Lucan conceived the Alps and the Pyrenees as lying lower than Africa.

The explanation of *desuper* is, I think, to be sought in the crude language of popular physical geography which Lucan is not ashamed to reproduce in IX. 351, where he says that Libya is of all lands the nearest to the sky :

nam proxima caelo est,  
ut calor ipse docet.

With this conception in one's mind, one might well imagine the journey from Africa to any other part of the world, even to the towering Alps, as a journey downwards. Lucan was no doubt glad to use the idea, for it gave him an opportunity to introduce a paradox ('down to the Alps and the Pyrenees'), one of those cheap devices which delighted the rhetorically trained Roman.

I regret that I recently took Hosius to task for not branding the traditional reading of v. 688 as impossible (*Class. Rev.* XXVIII. p. 236). Needless to say, the explanation given above had not then occurred to me.

VIII. 192 sqq. :

sic fatur : at ille

iusto uela modo pendentia cornibus aequis  
torsit, et in laeuum puppim dedit, utque secat  
quas Asinae cautes et quas Chios asperat undas,  
hos dedit in proram, tenet hos in puppe rudentis.

Pompey has sailed from Mytilene, taking Cornelia with him. When evening comes on the sight of the stars suggests some questions on navigation. The skipper replies to these, and then asks Pompey in what direction he is to go. Pompey answers that he does not care, provided that the ship avoids Italy and those fatal shores of Thessaly from which he has just fled (189-190).

The boat had obviously rounded the south-east corner of Lesbos, and was therefore in the strait between that island and Chios when Pompey was asked for instructions. The skipper then turned to the left (194), i.e. to the south. The course decided upon may well have lain between the Oenussae islets and the west coast of Chios, as Dr. Postgate believes (*C.Q.* I., p. 77). But the readings of the MSS., *Asinae*, *Sasinae*, are impossible, and the familiar conjectures *Asiae* and *Samiae* are little better. Dr. Postgate therefore suggests that 'until something better be proposed' we should delete *quas* at the beginning of v. 195 and read :

Oenusae cautes, et quas Chios asperat undas.

This conjecture is somewhat bold, as the author admits, but it at least gives us something which is intelligible. It seems not unlikely, however, that the meaningless *Lasinae*, mentioned as a variant at the end of Stephanus' edition (1545) may point the way to a solution of the difficulty. If we read *Lasiae* we obtain excellent sense. *Lasia* was another name for Lesbos, according to Pliny, *H.N.* V. 139. 'The waters ruffled by the rocks of *Lasia* and of Chios' will then be the channel between Lesbos and Chios. The skipper turns to the south and cuts across (*secat*) these waters.

The reading *Lasinae*, as far as I am aware, rests solely on the authority of Stephanus, but it is not likely to have been invented, and it (or, better still, *Lasiae*) may yet be found in some of the numerous extant MSS. of Lucan.

VIII. 637-639—Cornelia, seeing the murder of Pompey, cries out in agony.

At non tam patiens Cornelia cernere saeum  
quam perferre nefas miserandis aethera comple  
uocibus.

This sentence has troubled the commentators sorely. 'But Cornelia, not having so much strength to behold the cruel outrage as to endure it, filled the air with pitiable cries'—such is the usual rendering of the passage. Obviously this will never do, and we need not wonder that emendation has been attempted. It certainly looks at first sight as if *perferre* were wrong. Heinsius most ingeniously conjectured *uir ferre*, which gives good sense at the expense of smoothness and palaeographical probability. Haskins would understand *patiens fuisse* with *perferre*, and one might be thankful to acquiesce in this if no other explanation of the traditional text were possible. But with two inveterate misconceptions removed the meaning of the sentence will become quite clear.

In the first place, *saeum nefas* means 'cruel wrong,' not 'the cruel wrong'; it is quite general in meaning, and covers many tragedies besides the murder of Pompey. In the second place, *non tam patiens* = *quae non tam patiens erat* (or *esse solebat*): it denotes not a temporary but a habitual state. Cornelia is the Griselda of the poem. Her life, from the battle of Carrhae onwards, was full of tragedy and sorrow, but as depicted by Lucan she thinks of her troubles in the most unselfish manner, scarcely considering her own sad plight, but always considering how each blow affects Pompey, or later, Pompey's memory. This is the Cornelia whom the poet describes as 'ever stronger to endure cruel wrong than to witness it.'

The use of the Present Participle as an attribute expressing a constant characteristic is occasionally found in the classical period (e.g. Cat. LXII. 8, Hor. C. II. 14. 15: *ib.* 16. 23), but did not become common till post-Augustan times. Lucan, like Seneca, has many examples; to those cited by Mr. Heitland (Haskins' ed. p. cvi) add I. 104, 358, 529; IV. 189; V. 6, 619. If Lucan had written *numquam tam patiens* his commentators would probably have understood him better: cf. II. 650:

The  
a hasty b  
as to re  
involved  
and has  
as proprie  
gests no  
for nostr  
the urn,  
must fol  
this is u  
'hand.'  
the fact  
saddest  
that no  
them du  
the pas  
Pompey  
hand th  
i.e. if it  
foreign  
His han  
sad offi  
loved, a  
Italy w  
ought n

It is s  
nostra,  
S. II. 2

ives us  
at the  
dition  
siae we  
ling to  
Chios'  
to the  
ority of  
er still,  
an.  
agony.  
ia, not  
ed the  
viously  
s been  
einsius  
xpense  
rstand  
s if no  
n two  
ecome  
ong';  
murder  
rat (or  
is the  
as full  
bles in  
lways  
This  
cruel  
stant  
XII. 8,  
rustan  
itland  
n had  
nder-

at numquam patiens pacis longaeque quietis  
armorum, ne quid fatis mutare liceret,  
adsequitur, generique premit uestigia Caesar.

## VIII. 767-770:

## Fortuna recursus

si det in Hesperiam, non hac in sede quiescent  
tam sacri cineres: sed te Cornelia, Magne,  
accipiet nostra manu transfundet in urnam.

These words are spoken by Cordus, the soldier who gave Pompey's body a hasty burial on the Egyptian shore. He hopes, if he should be so fortunate as to return safe to Italy, to convey the ashes to Cornelia. The difficulty involved in *nostra manu* has been well explained by Dr. Postgate (C.Q. I., p. 221), and has been noticed by many others, giving rise to various conjectures, such as *propriaque*, *castaque*, *maestamque*, for *nostraque*. Dr. Postgate ingeniously suggests *nostroque sinu*. We should certainly have expected *sua*, not *nostra manu*, for *nostraque manu transfundet in urnam* cannot mean 'and shall pour them into the urn, taking them from my hand.' If we retain the traditional reading we must follow Francken in explaining *nostra manu* as equivalent to *nostra ope*, but this is unnatural; the context justifies us in believing that *manu* here means 'hand.' Discussions of the passage seem to have given too little attention to the fact that *manu* in v. 770 is contrasted with *manu* in v. 767. Almost the saddest feature of Pompey's end, from the ancient point of view, was the fact that no relative was near to light the pyre and to gather the ashes and give them due burial (cf. IX. 56-68, which deserves to be studied in connexion with the passage under discussion). The soldier realizes this. Apostrophizing Pompey's shade he pleads that his service may be accepted, urging that the hand that lights the pyre is at least a Roman hand, *Romana succensa manu est*, i.e. if it is not the hand of a near relative, it is at any rate not the hand of a foreigner (*manus Aegyptia*, IX. 63). But he does not rest content with this. His hand, though *Romana manus*, is the hand of a humble stranger. The last sad office should be performed by the hand of one whom Pompey knew and loved, and Cordus promises that it shall be so, if only he be spared to return to Italy with the hero's ashes. The kind of epithet required for *manu* in v. 770 ought now to be fairly obvious. Surely Lucan wrote:

sed te Cornelia, Magne,  
accipiet, *notaque* manu transfundet in urnam.

It is scarcely necessary to cite examples of the confusion of *nota*, etc., with *nostra*, etc., but one may refer to Markland's interesting note on Stat. S. II. 2. 142.

W. B. ANDERSON.

## NEW EVIDENCE FOR THE TEXT OF FESTVS.

THE Teubner edition of Festus *de Verborum Significatu* had scarcely appeared when Professor Anspach announced (in the *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* of November 29, 1913) his discovery of a MS. of Isidore's *Etymologies* (A 18 of the Vallicelli Library, Rome) with some Scholia taken from Festus. Last Easter, in the limited time at my disposal, I transcribed from the MS. the greater part of this Isidore Commentary and, later, received a transcript of the remainder from Abbé Liebaert some weeks before his death. Although hampered by the deficiencies of our University Library, I am unwilling to keep this new evidence any longer from students of Festus.

The whole Commentary might well be published (under the title 'Anecdoton Anspachii') as, at the very least, an interesting specimen of mediaeval editing, but would occupy too much space. It is here reduced to workable size by the omission of most of the Scholia taken from the Christian Fathers and many of those from Pliny *Naturalis Historia*. Pliny's encyclopaedic work has been much used by the commentator. Some Scholia indeed which, at first sight, would be referred to Pliny are in reality taken directly from Pliny's imitator, Solinus. Still a certain number are explicitly ascribed to Pliny himself (e.g. *Refert Plinius Secundus* fol. 78<sup>r</sup>, fol. 79<sup>v</sup>; *Plinius Secundus refert* fol. 84<sup>r</sup>), just as a certain number are explicitly ascribed to Christian writers (e.g. *In expositione beati Ieroni<mi> super epistolam ad Galatas* fol. 31<sup>v</sup>; *ut ait Ambrosius* fol. 48<sup>v</sup>; *Secundum Gregorium* fol. 107<sup>r</sup>); others have patently been copied, word for word, from the *Naturalis Historia*. My notes shew that I deliberately refrained from transcribing, apart from Christian Scholia, the following: (1) on foll. 27<sup>r</sup>, 68<sup>v</sup>, 69<sup>r</sup>, 70<sup>v</sup>, Medical Scholia, (2) on fol. 68<sup>r</sup>, one about the Emperor Theodosius, (3) on foll. 71<sup>v</sup>-78<sup>v</sup>, 80<sup>r</sup>-81<sup>r</sup>, Natural History Scholia, (4) on foll. 81<sup>v</sup>, 82<sup>v</sup>, 83<sup>v</sup>, Physics Scholia, (5) on foll. 84<sup>v</sup>-86<sup>r</sup>, 92<sup>v</sup>, 93<sup>r</sup>, 94<sup>v</sup>, Geography Scholia, (6) on foll. 100<sup>v</sup>, 102<sup>r</sup>, 106<sup>r</sup>, Mineralogy Scholia, (7) on foll. 112<sup>r</sup>-115<sup>v</sup> Botany Scholia, (8) on fol. 116<sup>r</sup>, instances of fortitude, etc. They seemed all (except the second) to come from Pliny (or Solinus), or at any rate to have nothing to do with Festus. But now that the importance of these Scholia (for other authors as well as Festus) has revealed itself, it is clearly necessary to examine carefully every one of them. Perhaps some resident at Rome, when the Vallicelliana is again accessible, will kindly supplement the account which follows here:

- ad Isid. *Etym.* 1, 28, 1] Analogia, id est assimilatio sermonum uel rationum.
- 3, 21, 5] Pythaules dicti sunt a Pythoni qui primum tibiis aeneis cecinit. Idem et spondaules dictus est.
- 3, 28] Gaueriosus (*leg.* Berosus) quidam in tantum in astrologia claruit, ut ei ob diuinis praedictiones Athenienses publice in gymnasio statuam inaurata lingua statuerent (cf. Plin. *N.H.* 7, 123).
- 3, 54, 1] Lunae rationem primus Endymion deprehendit, ideoque fabulose dictus est Lunam amasse (? cf. Plin. *N.H.* 2, 43; ?? cf. Fulgent. *Myth.* 58, 5 H). Luna humorem cum calore permixtum . . . corrumpuntur putredine (= Basil. *Hexaem.* 933 C-D of Migne's edition. At the side: BASILIUS).
- 3, 71, 26] Anaximander Milesius primus signa XII . . . sequitur Septemtriones (= Plin. *N.H.* 2, 110).
- 5, 24, 14] Codicillus intelligitur hoc quod minus est in testamento suppletio.
- 5, 29, 1] Momentum a motu siderum celerrimo nuncupatur. Plurimi scriptores indifferenter breuissimum illud temporis spatium quo palpebra oculi nostri moueri potest, quod in ictu pungentis transcurrit, quod secari et diuidi nequit, nunc momentum, nunc punctum, nunc atomum (athomam cod.) uocant (= Bede *Temp. Rat.* iii). 5, 30, 5] Dies nomen inde sumens quod tenebras a luce disiungat ac diuidat (ibid. v in.).
- 5, 33, 3] Priusquam Caesar Augustus XII menses statueret, nonnumquam accidebat ut menses qui fuerant transacti hieme modo aestium (-vo cod.), modo autumnale tempus incidenter. Itaque uniuersam hanc inconstiam Caesar incisa temporum turbatione conposuit (= Solin. 1, 44-45). Commodus imperator Ianuarium mensem Amazonem, Septembrium Commodum censuit appellari.
- 5, 33, 11] Domitianus Septembrem Germanicum, Octobrem suo nomine censuit appellari.
- 5, 36, 4] Temporibus Augusti Caesaris cursus anni perspecta ratio est quae antea profunda caligine tegebatur. Nam apud Romanos decem mensibus computabatur, apud Arcadas tribus, apud <A>carnanas sex, apud Lauinios tredecim. Galli[s] sexta luna principia mensuum annorumque faciebant (cf. Solin. 1, 34-35).
- 5, 37, 2] Quinquennium fuisse quo senator nullus (-li cod.) . . . condidere (= Plin. *N.H.* 7, 157).
- 5, 38, 3] Apud Gallos saeculum XXX annis habebatur.
- 6, 8, 9] Stromatum qui dicuntur libri in Latinum dici possunt opere uario contexti. Hypotyposeson libri sunt quos nos possumus dicere informationum uel dispositionum (?? cf. Jerome *de Viris Illust.* 38). Hypomnesticon commonitorium.
- 6, 17, 27] Bissexturn Caesar Augustus instituit annumque CCCLXV dies et quadrantem habere statuit (? cf. Bede *Temp. Rat.* xii, ad fin.).
- 7, 11, 4] Apollonia uirgo apud Alexandriam iam grandaeua aetate elapsa impiorum manibus in ignem praeparatum sponte prosiluit.

7, 12, 18] Sacerdotes feminae quae in templo Berecynthiae erant Melissae dicebantur, a Melissa quadam quae prima sacerdos fuerat sic appellatur (*sic*) (cf. Lact. *Inst.* 1, 22, 20).

Flamines, id est sacerdotes paganorum, calce*<i>s* de morticinis pellibus non utebantur.

8, 7, 6] Hos Hyginus (eginus *cod.*) primum frusta[m] hircinae carnis praemium accepisse dicit et inde nomen traxisse, scilicet a trago quem Latini hircum uocant; siue quod faece uultus suos linirent, quia personae usus nondum erat inuentus, tryga autem Graece faex dicitur; siue a uino quod praemii nomine accipiebant. Nam tryx uinum dicitur, unde et trygeton Graece uindemia dicitur.

ibid. Sed comici] Hi et comastes sunt dicti quia circum uicos dicta dicebant, faece oblita facie ne erubescerent; unde ligadae sunt appellati.

8, 7, 8] Coraules operti palliis uoce caneabant, unde et appellati sunt (? cf. Hyginus *Fab.* 273, p. 147, 9 S.).

8, 9, 8] <Marcello> Circa mortem cum perit ab Hannibale sacrificante in extis iecur defuit, exitium ei portendens. Item Gaio principi, cum iniret . . . est ueneno. Caesari . . . sacrificantibus in extis cor defuit. Diuo Augusto . . . annum imperium (= Plin. *N.H.* 11, 189 et 186).

8, 11, 26] M*<y>*agrū pagani dicunt muscarum deum (cf. Plin. *N.H.* 10, 75; Solin. 1, 11).

8, 11, 34] Scholia from Lact. *Inst.* 1, 20, 33; 1, 22, 19; 1, 20, 37. ibid. 30] d<sup>o</sup>. 1, 22, 9-11. ibid. 45] d<sup>o</sup>. 1, 6, 2 sqq.

8, 11, 30] Herculem credebant deum uirtutis. Dicitur autem Hercules Graece Heracles quasi eron cleos, quod Latine uirorum (utr- *cod.*) fortium famam dicimus. Fuit autem, ut scribit Festus Pompeius (-ponius *cod.*) agricola ideoque Augei gregis stabulum stercoribus purgasse refertur, quia proprie agricolarum est stercorare agros. Quod mala ab Hesperidibus petisse fertur, pecorum per hoc cura signatur, quae Graece mila dicuntur. Item armenti, cum Geryonis boues abegisse narratur. Per aprum autem quod supinum portasse fingitur, sues feros mansuetos fecisse monstratur. Per canem tricipitem uenandi studium gessisse intenditur.

8, 11, 61] Angerana (*sic*) dea silentii obsignatum os habens Romae colebatur (cf. Solin. 1, 6). Curetes, Iouis filii, a curandis corporibus dicti. Fornacem deam pagani colebant, cuius festa Furnacalia (*sic*) dicebant. Cunina quae infantes tuerit in cunis ac fascinum (hac farc- *cod.*) summouet (= Lact. *Inst.* 1, 20, 36) dea dicta est. Veneri Caluae (Venericule *cod.*) simulacrum colebant[ur] pro eo quod Gallis urbem occupantibus ex mulierum capillis tormenta et pugnatrixia facta sint (cf. Lact. *Inst.* 1, 20, 27). Venerem armatam ob hanc causam colebant Lacedaemones. Cum contra hostes suos exissent, his armatae mulieres auxilium ferentes obuiam ierunt, sed cum uiros suos cernerent parare se ad pugnam, corpora sua nudauerunt; at illi uxoribus cognitis sicut erant armatae (*sic*) permixti sunt: ob hoc

Veneri arma apposuerunt (cf. Lact. *Inst.* 1, 20, 30-32). Pauorem et Pallorem ut deum Tullus Hostilius coluit; Mentem quoque ut deam senatus coli instituit (cf. *ibid.* 11 et 13). Lena apud Athenienses quaedam meretrix tyrannum occidit, et quia turpe fuit simulacrum construere meretrici, templo animalis . . . gerebat (*ibid.* 2-3). Faula apud Romanos quaedam meretrix, pro eo quod Herculi[s] occubuit, dea dicta est (cf. *ibid.* 5). Bellona dea belli; haec et Hymirinis (? *leg.* etiam Erinys) dicitur. Febris quoque fanum Romae in Palatio publice fuit dicatum et Malae Fortunae in Esquilio monte (cf. Plin. *N.H.* 2, 16).

8, 11, 68] Flora meretrix magnas opes ex meretricia arte conquisuit ac populum scripsit heredem. Hinc Romani festum ei celebrant quem Floralia uocant. Eadem finixerunt deam florum esse, quia turpe ducebant meretricem coli. Ipsa est et Chlores (*sic*), Zephyri uxor, quia Zephyrus uentus flores creat (cf. Lact. *Inst.* 1, 20, 6 sqq.). Leda, quia cum ea Iuppiter concubuit, ex qua Castor et Pollux et Helena nati sunt, dea est habita: ipsa est Nemesis. Mutam deam colebant et hanc esse dicebant ex . . . Larundam (= *ibid.* 35). Caca (Ce- *cod.*) dea colebatur quia Herculi indicium fecit de furto boum, quos Cacus frater eius furauerat. Sterculus deus dictus est quia agros stercorare docuit (cf. *ibid.* 36). Esus et Teutanes Gallorum dii (cf. Lact. *Inst.* 1, 21, 3). Tutinus dicebatur apud stultos deus in cuius . . . delibasse putaretur (= *id.* 1, 20, 36). O qualis dementia!

8, 11, 97] Pietatis sacellum apud Romanos fuerat ob hoc ita appellatum. Dum enim pater cuiusdam puerperae in carcere clausus esset et ei alimonia negarentur, filia ad eum dum introiret et exquireretur a custodibus ne forte cibum parenti ministraret, alere eum uberibus deprehensa est; mox morti destinatus pietati[s] filiae donatus est et locus sacer effectus (cf. Solin. 1, 124-125).

8, 11, 84] Osiris, Isidis filius, Aegyptiorum daemona deus. Hunc Serapidem dicunt (cf. Lact. *Inst.* 1, 21, 22). DE SACRIFICIIS DAEMONVM. Ioui Cretenses capram immolabant. Apud Cyprios humanam hostiam Ioui immolabant. In festiuitate Iouis Capitolini uirgines cursu certabant. Apud Tauros hospites Dianaem immolabant, etc. This long Scholium is patently a summary of Lact. *Inst.* 1, cap. 21 and 22, 15. It ends: Idcirco in sacris Faunae, uxorius Fauni, obuolutam uini amphoram ponunt quia ipsa cum (? *leg.* clam) olla biberat, propter quam causam a uiro suo extincta est; et quia in uita sua tantum a uiro suo uisa est, ideo et mulieres in opero (ap- *cod.*) sacrificant (cf. Lact. *Inst.* 1, 22, 9 sqq.).

8, 11, 102] Lamia dea siluae dicitur, habens pedes similes equi, manus uero et totum corpus pulchrum simile mulieris; et uiderunt multi et manserunt aliqui cum eis. (On *maneo* see *Arch. Lat. Lexik.* 3, 540.)

9, 1, 1] Rex Ponti Mithridates . . . dixit (= Solin. 1, 109).

9, 2, 95] Lecha fluuius est qui apud Germaniam per barbarorum fines currit, ex alia ripa Alamannos habens, a quo et Lechmanni, id est Lechae

homines, dicti sunt; nam apud eos man homo dicitur. Langi quippe eorum lingua longa, bardu barba dicitur.

9, 3, 29] Tribuni plebis uocati quia eos sibi, dum a senatu et populo premeretur, ob defensionem sui plebs creauit.

9, 3, 49] Subsidium dicebatur cum post proeliantes subsidebant ut cedenti acie ei auxilio essent; quod genus militum erat triariorum, qui iam emeruerant iusta stipendia et tamen retinebantur in castris. Et dicti triarii quod in tertio ordine militarent; ante hos qui in secundo loco erant praesidiarii uocabantur (cf. Fest. 398).

9, 3, 60] Classon (*κλάσσων*) Graece diuide dicitur.

9, 4, 9] Senatores primum Romulus centum elegit ad consilium tribuendum, quos et a senectute senatores uocauit.

9, 4, 43] Siquis tempore famis aliquem nutriendo saluasset, eum famulum habebat. Hinc et famulus dictus, ut quibusdam placet.

9, 4, 48] Hos Romani alio nomine Orcinos dicunt, ideo forsitan quia acceperint libertatem, sicut et uas quod aquas accipit orca dicitur; sicut et qui apud gentiles putatur mortuos accipere, Orcus.

9, 5, 10] Regi Antiocho ita quidam Artemon simulauit ut, defuncto Antiocho, Laudice uxor eius Artemoni diadema imponeret tamdiu quousque ex arbitratu eius regni successor ordinaretur. Pompeius et Vibius Romae alter pro altero uocabatur. Gemini frequenter similes generantur; quales etiam nostris diebus duo fuerunt Ceneta orti, e quibus alter Graso, alter Alo dictus est, adeo similes ut inter eos discernere difficile fuerit. Solent etiam et hi qui consanguinei non sunt similes esse. Nam apud Romanos Messala et Monogenes in tantum similes extiterunt ut non alium Messalam putarent quam Monogenem, nec Monogenem quam Messalam. Quaedam ancilla de dupli adulterio duos procreauit, utrumque patri similem. Similauit de Armentario mirmillo ('a gladiator of A.'?) et Cassio (? *leg.* -um), et Plancus et Rubrium histrionem (cf. Solin. 1, 80 sqq.; but the story of the Ceneda twins is added by the compiler).

9, 7, 27] Fantela uxor Fauni, ut Varro scribit, tantae pudicitiae fuit ut nullus eam, usque ad uixit, praeter suum uirum uiderit (cf. Lact. *Inst.* 1, 22, 10).

11, 1, 12] Cyrus tantae memoriae fuit ut omnes de suis nominibus propriis appellauerit. Fecit hoc idem in populo Romano Lucius Scipio. Cineas Pyrrhi . . . salutauit (= Solin. 1, 108-109).

11, 1, 14] Corpus compositum est ex corrupto et integro: cor a corde, pus integrum est, quod intelligitur custodia; sicut alibi 'in pure positis solus hic euasit.' Et intelligitur corpus cordis custodia (cf. Virg. *Gram.* p. 85, 20 H.; the *Abbreviatio* of Priscian by Bp. Ursus of Benevento, ed. Morelli, p. 11 = p. 291).

11, 1, 21] Strabo nomine quidam de Libitinario (*sic*) litore in portu Siciliensi per centum triginta quinque milia naues asperit; et ut fidem uerborum faceret, etiam numerum eorum dixit (cf. Plin. *N.H.* 7, 85; Solin. 1, 99).

11, 1, 52

men

Den

(=1

11, 1, 83

fuis

tass

11, 2, 41

hor

11, 2, 16

et u

11, 2, 30

pud

(cf.

11, 3, 21

sub

12, 1, 50

12, 1, 60

8, 1

12, 4, 24

12, 5, 32

32,

hyr

12, 7, 30

12, 7, 50

13,

cae

12, 7, 60

12, 7, 60

(13

12, 8, 1

12, 8, 1

13, 21,

122

14, 4, 1

Ita

quo

tau

Pac

(N.

app

circ

- 11, 1, 52] Quibus gemini procedunt a dextera parte dentes fortunae blandimenta permittunt (*sic*), quibus a laeva detimenta (= Solin. 1, 71). Dentes tantum inuicti sunt ignibus ne clementur cum reliquo corpore (= Plin. *N.H.* 7, 70).
- 11, 1, 83] Varro asserit Tritanum gladiatorem rectis et transuersis neruis fuisse non tantum crate . . . tactu superasse. Eius filium . . . reportasset (= Solin. 1, 75-76).
- 11, 2, 4] Infans a die quadragesimo ridere inchoat. Unum nouimus eadem hora risisse, Zoroastre<m> (cf. Solin. 1, 72).
- 11, 2, 18] Mulieres antiqui uiras appellabant, unde adhuc permanent uirgines et uiragines (= Fest. 314, 15; cf. *Etym.* 11, 2, 22-23).
- 11, 2, 36] Defuncta uirorum corpora supina fluitant, feminarum prona. Sic pudoris disciplinam etiam inter defuncta corpora natura decreuit (*sic*) (cf. Solin. 1, 95).
- 11, 3, 26] Pygmaei ipsi sunt nani quos uulgas septem caulinos uocat eo quod sub uno caule requiescere possint.
- 12, 1, 50] Gilbum nos blancum uocamus.
- 12, 1, 60] Asturcones dicuntur quos nos celdos (*sic*) uocamus (cf. Plin. *N.H.* 8, 166).
- 12, 4, 24] Celidri plurimi in Calabria sunt (? cf. Solin. 2, 33).
- 12, 5, 3] Sanguisuga et hyrundo alio nomine dicitur (? cf. Plin. *N.H.* 8, 29; 32, 123); ut est illud (Ser. Samm. 784): sunt quibus apposita siccatur hyrundine sanguis.
- 12, 7, 38] Ulula nos oloccum uocamus (cf. Serv. auct. *Ecl.* 8, 55).
- 12, 7, 51] Anatis caro suauior est pectore et ceruice. Unde et poeta (Mart. 13, 52): Tota tibi (*sic*) ponatur anas, sed pectore tantum Et ceruice (*sic*); caetera redde coco.
- 12, 7, 61] Unde et Ouidius (*Am.* 2, 6, 56): Oscula . . . mari.
- 12, 7, 62] Palumbi caro in cibum sumpta premit libidinem. Unde et Martialis (13, 67): Inguina torquati . . . salax.
- 12, 8, 13] Culices zinzalas dicimus.
- 12, 8, 14] Scinifex uulgo zinzales nominantur.
- 13, 21, 26] Padus apud ueteres Budincus etiam uocabatur (cf. Plin. *N.H.* 3, 122). Padus autem a palude nominatur (cf. Isid.).
- 14, 4, 18] DE ITALIA (red). Italia ob uini copiam Oenotria appellata est. Italiam Cato appellatam ait ab Italo rege; Timaeus quod in ea boun quondam fuerit multitudo, Graecos autem antiquos solitos esse uocare tauros italos, a quibus<sup>1</sup> uidentur dicti uituli. In Italia inter Appenninum Padumque longior hominibus uitae (*leg.* uita est), ut Plinio Secundo (*N.H.* 7, 162) placet.

Samnitibus nomen est inditum propter genus hastae quas saunia appellabant, quibus uti solebant. Alii dicunt ex Sabinis uere sacro natos circiter hominum septem milia duce Cominio Castronio profectos occu-

<sup>1</sup> So read in Paul. Fest. 94, 10 ab italis sunt dicti.

pasce collem cui nomen erat Samnio, indeque traxisse uocabulum (= Fest. 436).

Picena regio, ubi est Asculum, a Sabinis est appellata quod inde uere sacro nati cum Asculum proficiserentur, in uexillo eorum picus con-sederat (= Paul. Fest. 235).

Apulia a perditione nominata. *'Απολία* (sic) enim Graece perditio dicitur eo quod ibi sol calore nimio perdit uiuentia quaeque; sed et sol Appollo (sic) ab hac perditione uocatus est. Apulia gignit animal lepori simile quod prospere cata antiphrasin dicitur. Quodcumque enim animal tetigerit, praeter hominem, illico moritur. Hoc et subitellus dicitur, uel quia subito peremit, uel quia celer est. Nam nimium currit: fertur etiam tres pedes habere cum quibus currit; nam quartus breuis est et usque ad terram non pertingens.

14, 6, 32 ? (fol. 92<sup>r</sup>)] Terracina . . . mari (= Solin. 2, 22), et pro eo quia terrae sociata est Terracina dicta est. Siciliam ab Italia mare diuisit; hanc coniunxit. Lingea insula uocata de nomine mulieris ibidem sepultae (cf. Solin. 2, 9).

14, 8 (fol. 92<sup>v</sup>)] Vesulus mons Ligurum est superantissimus inter iuga Alpium (cf. Solin. 2, 25), dictus quia uidetur a longe solus, ceteris non apparentibus. Ab huius gremio Padus oritur (cf. Plin. *N.H.* 3, 117).

Auentinus mons dicitur a quodam rege sic nominato ibique sepulto (cf. Paul. Fest. 17; Serv. *Aen.* 7, 657).

14, 8, 23 ? (fol. 93<sup>r</sup>)] Campi Lapidarii in Liguria dicti quia ibi dimicante Hercule creduntur pluuisse saxa (cf. Solin. 2, 5).

15, 1, 55 ? (fol. 93<sup>v</sup>)] Roma Graece, Latine Valentia dicitur. Sed prius oppidum ab Euandro sic appellatum est ubi nunc ipsa est. Eraclydes dicit, Troia capta, Achiou sibi nunc Roma est deuenisse; dein, suadente Rome captiuam quadam nobilissima comite eorum, incensis nauibus posuisse sedes, et oppidum ab eo (ea?) Romen uocauisse. Agathocle<s> scribit Romen non captiuam fuisse, sed Ascanio natam Aeneae neptem appellationis istius causam fuisse. Traditur interea proprium et uerum Rom<a>e nomen uetitum publicari, et Valerium Soranum, quia contra interdictum id ausus fuerit eloqui, neci datum (cf. Fest. 326; Serv. auct. *Aen.* 1, 273; Solin. 1, 1-5).

15, 1 ? (fol. 95<sup>r</sup>)] Apsoron (-in ?) ciuitas Dalmatiae ex Apsirti nomine dicta est, quem rex A<ee>ta ad Iasonem persequendum misit. Cuius sepulcrum plenum serpentibus dicitur, ex quo qui exierit illico moritur (? cf. Hyginus *Fab.* 23, p. 54, 10 S.; 26, p. 55, 18 S.).

Barrium (sic) urbem Italiae conditores eius expulsi ex insula Barra, quae non longe est a Brundisio, appellauerunt (= Paul. Fest. 30).

Ardea a Dan<a>e condita est; Policlen a comitibus Herculis. Ionica[m] a Ione Naulochi filia dicta est quam Hercules interemis (cf. Solin. 2, 5-6).

Ameria urbs Vmbriae dicta a Miro conditore qui eo loco ex Corsa

(sic) prefectus est (cf. Paul. Fest. 19). Pupulonium (sic) Populonus condidit Amiri[s] frater; Sicidium Syllus condidit, Amiri et Populonii frater. Perusiam condidit Aulisces (Aulestes, Serv. auct. *Aen.* 10, 198), qui Romulo aduersus Sabinos auxilium tulit. Vrbem Vetus condidit Vetulus, Vulsin*<i>um* Vulsus, Bolaterris Volatrus. Hi tres fratres fuerunt, filii Rasenna (*ut uid., ex -ni*) regis ex Etruria. Habuerunt autem et alios nouem fratres, id est Pacidum, Falsum, Cortisum, Lusum, Persam, Trasonium, Beiolum, Apeleum, Tragum, qui omnes urbes singulas condiderunt, easque a suis nominibus appellauerunt.

Roma, ut Varro dicit, quadrata fuit (? cf. Solin. 1, 17). Moenia Romae metiuntur p(assus) XIII (XIII MCC Plin. *N.H.* 3, 66); habet portas XXXVII, ex quibus VII esse desierunt.

Aenaria, quod ibi Aeneas classem appulerit appellata (cf. Paul. Fest. 18).

Baulanum (sic) dictum quod Sabelli, cum sedes quaererent, bouem secuti sunt eo proposito ut ibi oppidum conderent ubi ille requieuisset. Igitur a bove Baulanum est appellatum.

Aricia ab Archilocho Siculo condita et appellata est. Caieta a nutrice Aeneae dicta, Lauinium ab uxore eius. Pisas Pelopidae condiderunt (cf. Solin. 2, 10, 13, 7).

Beneuentum, colonia . . . Maloe*<n>ton* uocabant (= Paul. Fest. 31). Beneuentum et Arpos Diomedes condidit (= Solin. 2, 10).

Ariminum a nomine . . . dictum (= Paul. Fest. 23).

Praeneste dicta est a Praeneste Vlixi nepote, Latini filio; ut alii uolunt, a C*<a>eculo* condita est (cf. Solin. 2, 9).

Atella dicta est quod atrae ficus, hoc est nigrae, eo loco abundant; atra enim diminutiuum atellam facit.

15, 3, 5] Alii putant a Pale pastorum ideo (sic) dictum Palatium, alii a Palanto (sic) muliere quam Hercules compresserat (cf. Solin. 1, 15).

15, 4, ? (fol. 97')] Fanum Herculis fuit in foro Boario in quo neque muscis neque canibus ingressus erat (cf. Plin. *N.H.* 10, 79; Solin. 1, 10). Ideo in templis paganorum foramina in tecto relinquebantur quia, cum Tarquinius . . . Terminus mansit, idem lapis quem pro Iove Saturnus comedid, quem poeta Capitolii . . . frueretur. Ad quam similitudinem cetera templa postea perforato in medio tecto fundata sunt (= Lact. *Inst.* 1, 20, 37 sqq.). Simili modo quia beati Petri, etc.

15, 15, 1] Iugerum appellatur spatium quantum iugum boum in die arare (-ri cod.) debet; compositum nomen ex duobus corruptis, uno nomine, alio uerbo: iugo scilicet *et* arare.

16, 25 (fol. 106')] Expensa ab aere appenso appellata. Compendium a pendendo dictum; dispendium damnum, impensam sumptum, usuram impendium; seruos qui aes dispenderant dispensatores ueteres dixerunt. Postea factum est ut numeraretur pecunia, non expenderetur; et tamen nomen pristinum mansit. Acdem Saturni a publica pecunia aerarium

appellarunt, quia pauperes adhuc Romani aere utebantur, et quod debebant aes alienum, quod possidebant aes suum dicebant. Vnde et adhuc, quamvis mutatis speciebus, nomina tamen ipsa perseverant. In nummis antiquis ideo ex una parte Ianus quia Ianus Saturnum dicitur excepisse cum nauigio uenit (cf. Lact. 1, 13, 6). Hinc Ouidius (*Fast. 1*, 239-240): At . . . dei.

Sestertius dipondium ualebat apud antiquos. Denarius apud antiquos decussim ualebat. Victorius dicebatur qui Victoriae figuram impressam habebat, et ualebat quinque. Ex hoc et quinariam appellabant. Iulius primus Victoriam in denarii fecit.

16, 26, 9] Metreta est mensura quae recipit centum sextarios. \*\*phi (the first two letters seem imitations of majuscule *oe*) mensura est capiens modios tres (cf. *Metrol.* p. 142, 1-4 H.).

17, 5, 32] Caper cum uitem praerosisset, plenius fructum attulit, atque hinc antiquitus putatio inuenta est (cf. *Hyg. Fab.* 274, p. 149, 8 S.).

17, 8, 4] Filuminus dicit stacten murram solutam esse. Nam est et ita durata ut ex ea pocula fiant quae appellantur murrina. Hinc est illud *Martialis* (3, 26, 1): Murrina solus habes, solus habes, Candide, nummos (*sic*).

18, 8] Victor historiographus: Ego uitiae principum pertractans, etc. (about the rarity of princes proficient in archery. This citation on fol. 117<sup>v</sup>, which I did not transcribe in full, does not appear in Pichlmayr's edition of *Aurelius Victor* nor in Mommsen's edition of *Victor Tunnunensis*. Does it refer to Domitian?).

18, 16, 2? (fol. 118<sup>v</sup>)] Ludorum genera plura erant: Panathenna (*sic*), ludi Atheniensium. In ludi Apollinis uictor mala accipiebat; certabant autem pythaules, qui tibiis aereis caneabant, et citharistae. Ludos funebres Perseus Polydectae (pollidecte *cod.*) nutritori suo primus instituit. Pommachus (*sic*) ludus Latine pancratius dicitur. Ludus diaulus; ludus c<a>estorum; ludus disci; ludus cen<o>taphi (cf. *Hyg. Fab.* 273, pp. 146-147 S.).

18, 52? (fol. 120<sup>r</sup>)] *Martialis* quidam iuuenis Carporoforus nomine temporibus Titi XX ursos in spectaculo contra se simul dimisso interfecit. Idem aduersus leonem, pardum et tigrin<sup>1</sup> aprumque pariter dimicauit.

19, 1, 11? (fol. 120<sup>v</sup>)] Alexandrini primi cera naues pinxerunt.

19, 1? (fol. 121<sup>r</sup>)] Argo nauem a poetis Mineruam dicitur fecisse et primam in pelagus misisse (? cf. *Hyg. Fab.* 14, p. 49, 16 S.).

19, 2, 3] Columbaria dicuntur in nauia quibus remi eminent (= *Fest. 168, 13*).

19, 16, 2] Monochromon, id est uno colore, Zeuxis quidam nomine pinxit. Callicles et Serapion minute pinxerunt. Hi enim primi artifices fuerunt. Apelles septem coloribus primus pinxit, idemque lumen et umbram primus inuenit. Alexander Magnus dixit ne quis . . . Pyrgo<teles> aere scalperet. Aristidis Thebani . . . licitus est (= *Plin. N.H. 7, 125-126*).

19, 22, 16] Linea genere suo appellata, quod ex lino fit (cf. *Isid.*).

<sup>1</sup> So *Mart. Spect. xv* must be defective. The epigram must have mentioned a tiger too.

Should we read in line 2 *quinta* for *quanta* (as at 7, 93, 7)?

19, 34,  
12,  
20, 2,  
pri  
Ro  
20, 3,  
fri  
ca  
Ce  
Ro  
ca  
Ab  
Italian  
South  
subject  
Liebae  
Festus,  
for, 'al  
script,  
foll. 17  
Beneve  
scripto  
second  
structio  
reconst  
this hu  
proven  
(exclu  
MSS. c  
counte  
should  
afterwa  
death  
the adv  
foll. 1-  
the sam  
Tempo  
Latinu  
etc. (c  
second  
MS. be

- 19, 34, 2 ? (fol. 127<sup>r</sup>)] Monocrepis dicitur uno pede calciatus (cf. Hyg. *Fab.* 12, p. 43, 15 S.).
- 20, 2, 15 ? (fol. 128<sup>r</sup>)] Hyginus<sup>1</sup> (*Eginos cod.*) philosophus pan, qui et artos, primus fruges consparsas in testa coxit. Hinc apud Graecos artos, apud Romanos panis appellatur.
- 20, 3, 2 ? (fol. 128<sup>v</sup>)] Vinum aegris dare Tero filius primus instituit. Vinum frigidum bibendum Cleofantes dari instituit. Vinum candenti ferro calefactum multis infirmitatibus medetur, maxime disinteriae. Quidam Cerassus nomine unum . . . miscere Graece cerase dictum est. Antiqui Romani in lectis triclin*< i >*aribus in fulcris capita asellorum . . . significantes eum uini suauitatem inuenisse (= Hyg. *Fab.* 274, p. 149 S.).

Abbé Liebaert pronounced the ornamentation of the MS. to be Central Italian. Its minuscule script, apparently of saec. xi-xii, is not the script of South Italy, the Beneventan type. Dr. Loew, the leading authority on the subject, ascribes the Festus MS. (now at Naples) to the Roman region. Liebaert convinced me that the famous uncial Glossary, associated with Festus, *Vat. lat. 3321*, was written rather in Central than in Southern Italy; for, 'although there are at the beginning of the volume scraps in Beneventan script, which have been taken from the binding, still the minuscule writing on foll. 170<sup>v</sup>-171<sup>r</sup> is not Beneventan and was written in the period when only Beneventan script was used in Southern Italy.' I inferred that it was the scriptoriums of Central Italy in the first place, and Monte Cassino in the second place only, which would be likely to provide material for our reconstruction of Festus; so my second volume, which will deal 'inter alia' with the reconstruction of Festus (and of Verrius Flaccus too), must be delayed until this hunting-ground should be well searched. Latin MSS. of Central Italian provenance would be likely to find their way into the Vatican collections (excluding the Palatini and Reginenses) and the other libraries of Rome. For MSS. of Southern Italy the Monte Cassino library must be added to these. I counted myself fortunate in having arranged with Abbé Liebaert that he should first search the Vaticana, the Vallicelliana, the Casanatense, etc., and afterwards visit Monte Cassino in quest of such scholia. Alas! his lamented death spoiled this and so many other plans which he himself had made for the advancement of knowledge.

But these scholia come from North-East Italy. The Isidore occupies foll. 1-131<sup>v</sup> (to one-third of col. ii) of the MS. There follows (on fol. 131<sup>v</sup>) by the same hand: Vir Beatissimus Domnus Grauso Episcopus Suis Quae Fecit Temporibus (all this in majuscules). Then comes: Scemata ex Graeco in Latinum eloquium figurae interpretantur quae fiunt in uerbis uel sententiis, etc. (cf. Isid. *Etym.* 1, 36). This ends on fol. 132<sup>v</sup> near the beginning of the second column, the rest of the page being blank. (The remaining part of the MS. belongs to the Renaissance period.) Grausus was Bp. of Ceneda c. 1000 A.D.

W. M. LINDSAY.

ST. ANDREWS,  
November 9, 1915.

<sup>1</sup> Editors of Cassiodorus, please note.

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

### LITERATURE AND GENERAL.

**American Journal of Philology.** Vol. XXXVI. 3. 1915.

J. A. J. Drewitt, *The -σσ- Forms in Homer*. The writer would show that the doubling of the σ is metrical and due to 'the stress of the arsis.' He thinks that in the case of 'Αχιλλεύς and 'Οδισσέύς forms like 'Αχιλῆος and 'Οδισσῆος arose through cross associations by the side of the correct ones 'Αχιλλῆος 'Οδισσῆος. B. O. Foster, *The Trojan War Again*. Defends Van Leeuwen's theories against the attacks of Prof. John Scott. The events of the original *Iliad* fell into a single year; the passages which mention or appear to presuppose a ten years' war are either interpolated or inconclusive. A. L. Forthingham, *Grabovius-Gradivus. Plan and Pomerium of Iguvium*. Grabovius is to be equated to Gradivus as the moving, marching god. The basis of the *templum*, *arx* and city of Iguvium was the triangular form. John C. Rolfe, *The so-called callium prouincia*. Discusses the problems arising out of the passages cited by the Thesaurus under this heading, *Tac. Ann.* 4. 27 'Curtius Lupus quaestor cui prouincia utere ex more calles ('Cales' Lipsius) euenerant,' *Suet. Iul.* 19 'prouinciae . . . minimi negotii, i.e. siluae callesque,' *Q. Curt.* 3. 4. 5 being rejected as irrelevant.

**Berliner philologische Wochenschrift.** 1915.

Nov. 27. L. Radermacher, *Die Erzählungen der Odyssee* (Hausrath). C. W. Nauck, *Des Q. Horatius Flaccus Oden und Eponen*, erkl. von C. W. N., 18th edition, revised (a second time) by P. Hoppe (Röhl). The editor has carefully studied recent work on the subject. *Die Handschriften der badischen Hof- und Landesbibliothek in Karlsruhe*. VI.: A. Holder, *Die Reichenauer Handschriften* beschrieben und erläutert. 2. Band: *Die Papierhandschriften. Fragmenta. Nachträge* (Weinberger). T. Wegeleben, *Die Rangordnung der römischen Centurionen* (Soltau). W. throws some light on a difficult problem, and makes good use of inscriptions. R. Blümel, *Einführung in die Syntax* (Meltzer). A volume of the 'Sprachwissenschaftliche Gymnasialbibliothek' edited by M. Niedermann. Highly praised as a clear exposition of the views of J. Ries, Wundt, Brugmann and others.

Dec. 4. H. G. Viljoen, *Herodoti fragmenta in papyris servata* (Kallenberg). A useful collection of the fragments and a careful comparison of the forms found in them with those found in the MSS.

Dec. 11. K. Ziegler, *Catalogus codicum classicorum Latinorum qui in Bibliotheca urbica Wratislaviensi adservantur compositus a K. Z.* (Kroll). Part of the work was done by Skutsch, Wünsch and others. A. Ferrabino, *Kalypso. Saggio d'una Storia del Mito (Gruppe)*. Anyone who is studying the myths of Perseus, Demeter, Cacus or Cyrene will do well to consult this book. The section on Cacus is specially valuable; the author shows that it is a mistake to suppose that Virgil's story is mainly the product of his own imagination. J. H. Lipsius, *Das attische Recht und Rechtsverfahren* (Thalheim). Vol. III., completing the work. H. Blümner, *Technologie*

und Terminologie der Gewerbe und Künste bei Griechen und Römern. I. Zweite, gänzlich umgearbeitete Auflage (Tittel). The first edition appeared forty years ago; this may be regarded as a new book. A. Thumb, *Grammatik der neugriechischen Volkssprache* (Bees). A small book for beginners.

Dec. 18. C. Zander, *Eurythmia vel compositio rythmica prosae antiquae*. II. *Numeri Latini aetas integra vel rythmicae leges antiquioris orationis Latinae* (Ammon). Gives an appreciative sketch of contents. E. C. Quiggin, *Essays and Studies presented to William Ridgeway*, ed. by E. C. Q. (Pfister). Gives a list of the papers which concern the classical scholar. F. K. Ginzel, *Handbuch der mathematischen und technischen Chronologie*. III. Band (Soltau). For the student of the classics the chapters on 'Die Zeitrechnung in Makedonien, Kleinasiens, Syrien' and 'Altgermanische und keltische Zeitrechnung' are useful, also the appendices and comparative tables. S. Gsell, *Histoire ancienne de l'Afrique du Nord*. Tome I.: *Les conditions du développement historique, les temps primitifs, la colonisation phénicienne et l'empire de Carthage* (Regling). The first part of an important work.

Dec. 25. R. Heinze, *Virgils epische Technik* (Helm). M. Mayer, *Apulien vor und während der Hellenisierung* (Wide). A quarto volume with many illustrations putting together the results of many years' work.

1916. Jan. 1. H. v. Arnim, *Platos Jugenddialoge und die Entstehungszeit des Phaidros* (Raeder). The principal object of the book is to show in what order the earlier dialogues were written. The writer tries to find in the subject-matter an answer to the questions which in an earlier work he tried to solve by the evidence of the language. G. Plaumann, *Griechische Papyri der Sammlung Gradenwitz* (Gelzer). 'This edition of fragments of papyrus of the third century B.C. is a masterpiece.' F. Bücheler, *Kleine Schriften*. I. (Schmalz). It is intended to reprint B.'s contributions to periodicals and other writings which did not appear in book-form. The first volume contains sixty-one papers. H. Lietzmann contributes to this number an obituary notice of Paul Wendland.

Jan. 8. A. W. Ahlberg, *C. Sallusti Crispi Bellum Jugurthinum* (Klotz). Gives a full record of the readings of the MSS. M. San Nicolò, *Ägyptisches Vereinswesen zur Zeit der Ptolemäer und Römer*. Zweiter Band. Erste Abt. (Poland). As good as the first volume. Πρακτικὰ τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις ἀρχαιολογικῆς ἐταιρείας τοῦ ἑτού 1913 (Kern). J. H. Schmalz contributes to this number a paper 'Zu Sallustius (Jug. 79, 8; 102, 3; 12, 3; 97, 5)' in which he praises Ahlberg's work, but disagrees with his reading in the passages named.

Jan. 15. B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Part X. ed. by B. P. G. and A. S. H. (Sitzler). As good as the earlier volumes. F. Vollmer, *Poetae latini minores*. Post Aemilium Baehrens rec. F. V. Vol. V. (Tolkiehn). This edition of the works of Dracontius is not a mere reprint of the larger edition in *Mon. Germaniae Auct. antiq.* Tom. XIV. (1905). The text has been carefully revised. H. Diels, *Antike Technik*. Sechs Vorträge. Mit 50 Abbild. und 9 Tafeln (Max C. P. Schmidt). The reviewer gives an interesting account of the contents, and suggests that when Sophocles described the cave of Philoctetes (βίστρος πέτρα and δι' ἀμφιτρήτος αἰλίον) he had in mind the description by Herodotus of the tunnel at Samos (ἄρνυμα ἀμφίστορον, III. 60), which Sophocles must have seen when he took part in the conquest of the island.

Jan. 22. L. Schönberger, *Studien zum 1. Buch der Harmonik des Claudius Ptolemäus* (Max C. P. Schmidt). P. N. Ure, *Black Glaze Pottery from Rhitsona (Anthes)*. Brief sketch of contents.

Jan. 29. H. Menge, *Repetitorium der lateinischen Syntax und Stilistik*. Zehnte Auflage (Schmalz). A useful reference book for classical Latin. Carefully revised. Good index. J. van Wageningen, *M. Manilius Astronomica*, ed. J. v. W. (Kraemer).

Text with Praefatio (23 pages) and useful indexes. *Festgabe Hugo Blümner überreicht zum 9 Aug. 1914 von Freunden und Schülern* (Pfister). The reviewer sketches the contents. C. W. Keyes, *The rise of the equites in the third century of the Roman empire* (Soltau). A Princeton University dissertation. Good use has been made of inscriptions.

Feb. 5. Fr. Helmreich, *Der Chor im Drama des Aeschylus*. I. (J. Ziehen). A valuable study of the growing importance of the actor at the expense of the chorus in *Pers.*, *Suppl.*, *Sept.*, *Prom.* L. Dittmeyer, *Guilelmi Moerbekensis translatio commentatio Aristotelicae De generatione animalium* (Rudberg). Valuable for the study of the text of Aristotle. R. Dussaud, *Les civilisations préhelléniques dans le bassin de la Mer Égée* (Wide). The second edition, which is much larger and more fully illustrated than the first, is very highly praised. F. W. Robinson, *Marius Saturninus und Glauca*. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Jahre 106-100 v. Chr. 1912 (Lenschau). Advances our knowledge on some important points. M. Heynacher, *Beiträge zur zeitgemäßen Behandlung der lateinischen Grammatik auf statistischer Grundlage*. 2. Auflage (Schmalz). Such a book helps one to distinguish the more important facts from the less important. In this number W. Fox discusses the reading in *Cic. Mil.* 67, and comes to the conclusion that some such word as *creduntur* has been omitted. He would read *Quae si tamen creduntur, si metuitur etiam nunc Milo, non iam...*

**Classical Philology.** Vol. X. No. 4. 1915.

F. F. Abbott, *The Colonizing Policy of the Romans from 123 to 31 B.C.* Originally colonies were not sent outside Italy, the Roman ones being for purposes of defence and the Latin military outposts and centres of Roman influence. The Gracchi introduced the colony founded for social and economic reasons, as Tiberius' colonies at Scolacium, Tarentum and Carthage (Iunonia). The extension of the colonizing policy is marked by several developments; the growing influence of the commercial classes, the democratic movement, the pressure of the army and in particular the obliteration of the line of distinction between Italy and the provinces as seats for colonies. R. J. Bonner, *The Four Senates of the Boeotians*. Criticizes Mr. Walker's rejection (on the ground of the silence of the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*) of Thucydides' statement that the Boeotian federal Senate was quadripartite. H. L. Axtell, *Men's Names in the Writings of Cicero*. An analysis of Cicero's usage of the various combinations found of praenomen, nomen and cognomen. Lahmeyer's view that the invariable order where the praenomen is omitted is (1) nomen and (2) cognomen is refuted. H. R. Fairclough, *The tinus in Virgil's flora*. In *G. 4.* 112, 141 *tinus*, not *pinus*, is the right reading. The laurustinus, a great favourite of bees, is meant. Eleanor F. Rambo, *The significance of the Wing-entrances in Roman Comedy*. Discussion of the various exits and entrances of characters in the extant dramas. E. T. Merrill, *Cicero and Bithynicus*. The Pompeius Bithynicus of *Fam.* vi. 16 and 17 is the younger one. The two letters are not connected. Amongst Notes and Discussions J. A. Scott maintains that 'the Homeric caesura is purely metrical and furnishes little or no indication of the construction or meaning of the verse.' F. E. Robbins suggests that Eur. *Cycl.* 218 *μειγμένον* (*γάλα*) is an attempt to interpret the *ἄκρητον γάλα* of *Od.* 9. 297, J. C. Rolfe examines the use of *gens* and *familia* by Suetonius, R. P. Robinson defends 'Hortensius' in *Catull.* 95. 3 and A. R. Anderson Acro's interpretation of 'exstructis in altum diuitiis' *Hor. C. 2.* 3. 19 as rich mansions 'piled into the deep.' The date of Philocrates' archonship is now fixed for '266-5 B.C.', A. C. Johnson.

**Classical Weekly** (New York). 1915.

Dec. 4. J. L. Myres, *The Metropolitan Museum of Art. Handbook of the Cesnola Collection of Antiquities from Cyprus* (P. V. C. Baur). 'A masterly contribution to

religion and ritual is given as an introduction.' J. E. Sandys, *A Short History of Classical Scholarship* (C. N. Jackson). In a single volume presents the essential facts.

Dec. 18. F. Haverfield, *The Romanization of Roman Britain*. Third edition (H. R. Fairclough). 'Deserves careful consideration on the part of all students of Rome and early Britain.'

1916. Jan. 8. A. Fairbanks, *Athenian Lekythoi with outline Drawing* (T. L. Shear). This book and W. Riezler's *Weissgrundige Attische Lekythen* admirably supplement each other.

Jan. 15. John Burnet, *Greek Philosophy*. Part I., Thales to Plato (R. B. English). 'There is no other volume covering the same period in which the general reader is so well instructed and the scholar so highly edified.'

Jan. 29. F. Sommer, (1) *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre*. (2) *Kritische Erläuterungen zur lat. Laut- und Formenlehre*. 'The new edition of Sommer's indispensable Handbuch is much improved both in plan and in content. The most noteworthy innovation is the inclusion of copious references to the literature . . . the discussion of 148 controversial points had to be relegated to a separate volume, which is intended solely for specialists in historical grammar.' H. B. Van Hoesen, *Roman Cursive Writing*. A Princeton University Dissertation (C. U. Clark). 'The trained palaeographer will find the book of great value and suggestiveness, and it will be indispensable for every future effort to date a document in Roman script.'

Feb. 5. M. H. Morgan, *Vitruvius: The Ten Books on Architecture*. Translated by M. H. M. (W. N. Wetmore). 'The greatest of all the important works of Professor Morgan. It is faithful and exact.' A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (W. H. P. Hatch). 'This is a voluminous and exhaustive grammar of N.T. Greek. Dr. R. seems to have neglected no book or article of importance in the special field of N.T. grammar.' In this number is reprinted the text of the *Epitaph of Allia Potestas* with translation and notes.

**Mnemosyne.** XLIV. 1. 1916.

I. C. Vollgraff begins a series of articles containing emendations and suggestions on Plato's *Republic*, the present instalment dealing with Books 1 and 2. P. J. Enk, *The Composition of Plautus' Stichus*, contests the views (1) of Leo that the Stichus was 'contaminated' from three Greek plays, (2) of Suess who denies contamination altogether. The didascalia states that the play is derived from the *Adelphi* of Menander. Schoell has shown that M. wrote two plays so named, and that the Stichus is derived from the earlier. Enk, however, argues that Act V. cannot be traced to M.'s *Adelphi*. He supports Teuffel's view that Plautus has substituted a 'conuiuum seruorum' for M.'s 'conuiuum dominorum.' W. Vollgraff continues his study of Argive inscriptions of the third and second centuries B.C. He discusses (1) meaning of *ἀλιαί τελεία* occurring in a Mycenean inscription of the second century. He takes the words to mean a 'principal assembly,' several of which were held annually. (2) *δεύτερος*, the expression used for the last of the three divisions of the month. (3) *Πλάναρος* and *Αγυῆς*, names of Argive months hitherto unknown, found in an inscription in honour of the Rhodians. V. infers that they = May-June and June-July respectively. (4) In the light of this he deals with evidence for the season at which the Nemean games were held, which he places at end of May not, as others, at midsummer. (5) Citizens were enrolled according to a third-century inscription *ἐν φυλαῖς καὶ φάτραις καὶ πεντηκοστίν*. V. takes *πεντηκοστής* as =  $\frac{1}{5}$  of the land of Argos, but the *φάτρα* was retained for religious purposes. (6) V. refers to the arbitration of the Argives on the dispute between the Melians and Cimolians (discussed vol. 43, p. 383 sq.), supports Dittenberger in the view that it arose out of

the synedrion summoned by Philip in 338 B.C., and argues that forms found in the inscription are not inconsistent with this date. (7) V. gives text of an inscription in honour of Alexander of Sicyon (found in 1906), which he dates circa 249-244, and appends annotations. J. C. Naber, continuing his *Observations on Roman Law*, deals with the Law of Contract in Egypt under the Ptolemies and the Roman Empire. J. J. Hartman on Catullus LVIII. argues that we have here two distinct poems, (1) vv. 1-40, being a consolation to Manlius; (2) vv. 41-160, an elegy with dedicatory epistle to Allius. H. urges (1) difference of subject-matter of the verses; (2) name of person addressed in the first portion begins with a consonant, in the second with a vowel; (3) first part addressed to a non-resident, second to a resident at Rome; (4) person addressed in first part is ignorant of death of poet's brother, in second part knows of it. M. Boas has a note on the *Cod. Tuvonensis* of the Catonian monostichs. J. J. Hartman has short notes on Ov. *Tr.* V. 9, 35, on Thuc. V. 14 and on Plat. *Rep.* p. 600 E.

**Revue de Philologie.** Vol. XXXIX. Parts 2 and 3. 1915.

Alfred Ernout, Lucrèce, *de la Nature, livre IV.* : introduction, texte, traduction et notes. REVIEWS: P. Saintyves, *La force magique, Du mana des primitifs au dynamisme scientifique.* Paris, E. Norwy. Omont H., *Recherches sur la bibliothèque de l'église cathédrale de Beauvais* (Mémoires de l'Académie des inscriptions XL.). Paris, Klincksieck, 1914. *Revue des Revues et publications d'Académies relatives à l'antiquité classique.* Fascicules parus en 1914.

1  
n  
t  
n  
e  
t  
n  
n  
d

et  
ne  
se  
s,  
à